



THE CHURCHMAN'S LIBRARY

EDITED BY

JOHN HENRY BURN, B.D.

Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Aberdeen.

THE BEGINNINGS OF ENGLISH CHRISTIANITY. By W. E. COLLINS, M.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, King's College, London. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. [Ready.]

THE WORKMANSHIP OF THE PRAYER BOOK. By JOHN DOWDEN, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. [Ready.]

SOME NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS. By ARTHUR WRIGHT, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Queens' College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo, 6s. [Ready.]

EVOLUTION. By FRANK B. JEVONS, M.A., D.Litt., Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. [Ready.]

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN HERE AND HEREAFTER. By Canon WINTERBOTHAM, M.A., B.Sc., LL.B. Cr. 8vo, 3s. 6d. [Ready.]

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE NEW SCHOLARSHIP. By JOHN P. PETERS, Ph.D., Sc.D., D.D. Crown 8vo, 6s.

THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS. By E. T. GREEN, M.A., Professor of Hebrew and Theology at St. David's College, Lampeter.

THE CHURCHMAN'S PRIMER. By G. HARFORD-BATTERSEY, M.A.

THE CHURCHMAN'S DAY BOOK. By J. H. BURN, B.D.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH IN THE COLONIES AND MISSION FIELD. By ALLAN B. WEBB, D.D.

HISTORY OF THE PAPACY. By J. P. WHITNEY, M.A.

OUR CONTROVERSIES WITH ROME. By J. M. DANSON, D.D.

A POPULAR INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. By ANGUS M. MACKAY, B.A.

A POPULAR INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. By J. H. SHEPHERD, M.A.

THE HEBREW PROPHET. By L. W. BATTEN, Ph.D.

AN INTRODUCTION TO TEXTUAL CRITICISM. By A. M. KNIGHT, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Gonville and Caius College, Camb.

BIBLE REVISION. By J. J. S. PEROWNE, D.D., Bishop of Worcester.

DEVOTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES. By JOHN GOTTF, D.D., Bishop of Truro.

PREACHING. By FREDERIC RELTON, A.K.C.

THE WITNESS OF ARCHÆOLOGY. By C. J. BALL, M.A.

ENGLISH ECCLESIOLOGY. By J. N. COMPER.

CONFIRMATION. By H. T. KINGDON, D.D., Bishop of Fredericton.

INSPIRATION. By CANON BENHAM, D.D.

MIRACLES. By THOMAS B. STRONG, B.D., Student of Christ Church, Oxford.

PROVIDENCE AND PRAYER. By V. H. STANTON, D.D., Ely Professor of Divinity, Cambridge.

THE ATONEMENT. By R. M. BENSON, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford.

THE GREAT WORLD RELIGIONS FROM A CHRISTIAN STAND-POINT. By H. E. J. BEVAN, M.A., Gresham Professor of Divinity.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION. By J. A. MACCULLOCH.

ENGLISH ECCLESIASTICAL LAW. By W. DIGBY THURNAM.

THE OLD TESTAMENT
AND
THE NEW SCHOLARSHIP

BY

JOHN P. PETERS, Ph.D., Sc.D., D.D.

RECTOR OF ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH, NEW YORK

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
LONDON: METHUEN & CO.

1902

THIS VOLUME
IS DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF HIM
WHO WAS ALIKE
MY FLESHLY AND MY SPIRITUAL
FATHER

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

TO consider all the Old Testament problems which are, at the present moment, calling for solution would be far too large a field for one small volume. My effort has been to set before the reader first of all the fundamental problems involved in the acceptance of the Old Testament as Sacred Scripture, and in this part of the work I have been obliged to consider to some extent the New Testament also, since New and Old are inextricably bound together. To these fundamental problems—how the Bible has been and should be treated, what is to be understood by the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, the teaching of the Church with regard to those Scriptures, and the application of the doctrine of the Incarnation to the study of the written Word—I have devoted the first of the four parts of which this volume is composed.

In the second part I have endeavoured to trace briefly the history of that thought-development which has resulted in the modern methods of Bible study, commonly, but erroneously, called “Higher Criticism,” and to show more particularly how the application of the principles of evolution and comparison has affected our view of the history of the religion of Israel.

In the third part I have attempted to give an illustration of modern methods of Bible study in general by a particular application in the case of one book—Psalms.

Finally, I have devoted the fourth and last part to a survey of archæological discoveries bearing on the Old Testament, and the treatment of a few points in which the history of the religious, political, and literary history of Israel has been illuminated by archæological research, concluding, as in the former part, by a more particular illustration in the treatment of one book—Daniel.

I have chosen the problems of the books of Psalms and Daniel for more especial consideration, partly because in recent writings on the Old Testament—Introductions, Commentaries, and the like—these two books seem to me to have received the least satisfactory treatment, but chiefly because, having made a more special study of these books, I am more at home in them and better able to contribute something new to their discussion.

Some of the chapters of this volume have already appeared in substance in various publications, and one, the chapter on "The Bible, the Church, and Reason," was read before the American Church Congress in New York, in 1893. All these have been revised or entirely rewritten for the present volume, so that, while it seems proper to make this acknowledgment of former use, it is only fair to my readers and myself to say that all such material has been subjected to a new and careful study in the light of more recent discoveries and investigations.

With these words of explanation, I commend the volume to the kind consideration of my readers, trusting that it may help some who are perplexed over Old Testament problems.

CONTENTS

PART I

THE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINE OF THE BIBLE

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	THE ENGLISH BIBLE	3
II.	THE BIBLE, THE CHURCH, AND REASON	24
III.	THE INCARNATION AND THE NEWER CRITICISM	39
IV.	OUR LORD'S TREATMENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	55

PART II

EVOLUTION AND THE BIBLE

V.	MODERN STUDY OF THE BIBLE	81
VI.	THE RELIGIOUS EVOLUTION OF ISRAEL	99
VII.	THE RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MESSIANIC HOPE	135

PART III

THE BOOK OF PSALMS

VIII.	THE GROWTH OF THE JEWISH PSALTER	155
IX.	PSALM HEADINGS	184
X.	THE STORY OF THE PRAYER BOOK PSALTER	194

PART IV

ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE BIBLE

XI.	A REVIEW OF RESULTS	237
XII.	HOW THE OLD TESTAMENT WAS WRITTEN	256
XIII.	STONE WORSHIP	276
XIV.	THE ARK	284
XV.	THE BOOK OF DANIEL	293
	APPENDIX ON THE VIRGIN BIRTH	317
	INDEX	323

PART I

THE FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINE
OF THE BIBLE

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE NEW SCHOLARSHIP

CHAPTER I THE ENGLISH BIBLE

I. THE OLD TESTAMENT

THE books of the Hebrew Bible are arranged in three great divisions, called, respectively, The Law, The Prophets, and The Writings. The first of these great sections, the Law, comprises the five books which we commonly call the Pentateuch. These five books are treated in the Hebrew as one whole, and called not “the five books,” but “the five parts of the Law.” These five parts are named, respectively, after the words with which they commence: “In the beginning,” “And these are the names,” “And he called,” “In the wilderness” (not the first but almost the first word of Numbers in the Hebrew original), and “These are the words.”

The second great division, called the Prophets, is divided into two sections, called, respectively, the Former Prophets and the Latter Prophets, each of which consists of four books: the Former Prophets being Joshua, Judges, Samuel (in two parts), and Kings (also in two parts); and the Latter Prophets consisting of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve, that is the twelve minor prophets, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, which are regarded as one book, and are arranged among themselves in a purely haphazard manner, as it would seem, and not according to any system that has yet been discovered.

The third great division, the Writings, consists of Psalms,

4 THE OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW SCHOLARSHIP

Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Preacher, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles (in two parts), in the order and under the titles given.

The significance of this arrangement is not hard to find, and its historical value is very considerable in determining the date and the mutual relations of the books which compose the canon. The great divisions which we have observed mark three stages in the growth of the Old Testament canon, or perhaps we might say three canons of the Old Testament. The original Bible of the Hebrews was the Law. This was adopted as the canon of Holy Scripture about B.C. 440. Other books existed at that time, some of which were held in great reverence and ultimately accepted as Holy Scripture; but at the outset the Law alone was canonised, and to this day it has never lost the position of primacy thus given to it. In our Lord's time it was regarded as possessing a sanctity above the books of the later canon of the Prophets, a fact emphasised in the synagogue reading, as well as in the greater attention paid to the study of the Law by the schoolmen. The Law having been adopted as canon at an earlier date than the other books, became the Bible of the Samaritan as well as of the Jew, while the Prophets and the Writings, adopted by the latter after the hatred between the two churches had become intense, were not accepted by the former. It is owing to this fact that there have come down to us two independent Hebrew texts of the Pentateuch, the text of the Jewish and the text of the Samaritan Church, whereas we have but one Hebrew text of the remainder of the Old Testament. We are thus enabled to control the text of the Pentateuch from a critical standpoint, as we cannot in the Prophets and the Writings, where, besides the one official Jewish text, we have only translations into other languages. It ought to be added that, owing to the greater antiquity of the canon of the Law, the greater veneration in which it was always held, and the greater attention paid to its study, the text has come down to us in a better and purer condition than the text of any other part of the Old Testament.

The second canon of Holy Scripture adopted by the Jews, and added to the canon of the Law, was the canon of the Prophets. These were canonised officially, it is commonly supposed, about B.C. 200. This does not mean that the writings of the prophets, or most of them, had not been in existence long before this date, or that these writings or the greater part of them had not been held in respect or even counted sacred before this date, but that this is the date at which that canon was officially determined and the limit of the Prophets fixed. But although thus canonised, the Prophets were never regarded, as already pointed out, as quite so sacred as the Law. In the service of the synagogues the readings from the Prophets held an inferior position. For this reason also, as stated above, the text of the Prophets was not studied and handed down with so great care, so that while the text of the Pentateuch has come down to us in a practically perfect form, that of the Prophets presents many difficulties, owing to corruption of the original. But there is another reason also for the comparatively corrupt condition in which the text of some of the prophetical books has come down to us, namely, the long period which elapsed between the period of their composition and the period of their canonisation. It is now generally recognised that a great part of the writings known to the Jews as "The Prophets" was composed at an earlier date than that at which the Law was put into its final shape. Some of the prophetical books were composed before B.C. 700. A period of five hundred years, therefore, elapsed between the date of their composition and the date at which they were definitely accepted as sacred canon. During this long period they were not guarded and preserved with that careful conservatism with which we are familiar in the history of later Judaism, and the opportunity was afforded for many curious corruptions and changes of the text. What took place can be seen by anyone who will compare the Septuagint, or Greek translation, used by the Jews of Alexandria, with the Hebrew text which has come down to us, and which was the Bible of the Jews of Palestine. In the Law the two are identical, with

6 THE OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW SCHOLARSHIP

the exception of some altogether insignificant minutiae, but in some of the books of the canon of the Prophets the divergencies between the two are quite startling to those whose ideas of the quality of inspiration depend on the letter rather than on the spirit. So, for instance, in the First Book of Samuel parts of the story of David's encounter with Goliath are lacking in the Septuagint, namely, the part which tells of the way in which David chanced to come to the camp of Israel, and his meeting with his brothers (1 Sam. xvii. 12-31), and the part which tells of his interview with Saul and Jonathan after he had slain Goliath (chaps. xvii. 55 to xviii. 5). Indeed, as a general rule, in the canon of the Prophets, the Septuagint differs from the Hebrew by the omission of material which the latter contains. The most striking instance of this in the whole canon is in the Book of Jeremiah, which is about one-eighth shorter in the Alexandrine Greek Bible than in the Palestinian Hebrew. Moreover, the arrangement of the contents of the book is quite different in the two versions. It is evident on examination that the translators of the Septuagint had a different Hebrew text before them from that which has come down to us. Which is the more correct? and which stands nearer to the original? On that point opinions differ, and it is not my intention to go into the matter here. I have called attention to the difference merely to show the careless manner in which the text of the Prophets was treated during the period before those books were canonised, in comparison with the care bestowed on the accurate preservation of the text of the Law.

The third and last canon of sacred Scripture adopted by the Jewish Church was that of the Writings, and it is in this that we find those disputed books about which a battle was waged very like the battle in the Christian Church about some of the Catholic Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. Even in the age of the Apostles the limit of the Writings was still in dispute, and we find St. Jude referring to the Book of Enoch as canonical Scripture. In this he may be said to represent the party of inclusion as over against that of

exclusion. It was the latter party, the especially anti-Christian party, which finally prevailed, when about 100 A.D. the limits of the Writings were fixed by the Palestinian Jews as we now have them. The books in our present canon about which the battle raged the hottest were the Song of Songs and the Preacher or Ecclesiastes.

This last canon, as a whole, naturally took a position of authority inferior to that of the Prophets, just as the Prophets were inferior to the Law. This distinction is clearly marked in synagogue use, no lessons from the Writings being appointed for the regular Sabbath lessons. On certain festivals, however, five of these books, the so-called *Rolls*, were appointed to be read, namely, the Song of Songs at Passover; Ruth at Pentecost; Lamentations at the commemoration of the destruction of Jerusalem; Ecclesiastes at the Feast of Tabernacles; and Esther at Purim. It must not be understood, however, that none of the books constituting the canon of the Writings were regarded as sacred by the Jews before 100 A.D. It was not canonisation of these books which made them sacred: canonisation was rather the official recognition of what had already become the belief of the Church. Its main effect was to define the limit of the Palestinian canon by cutting off some of the books which the Alexandrian Jews had accepted.

In a general way, as may be seen from this résumé of the history of the growth of the Old Testament canon, we should look for the older books in the older canon, and especially is this the case as between the two later canons, the Prophets and the Writings. In the case of the Law there is a question of difference in kind, the books of that canon having been set off from those that follow, not so much on the ground of age as on the ground of their difference of contents. But as between the Prophets and the Writings no such difference of contents exists. That which has placed Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings in the Prophets, while Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and Esther are in the Writings, is the difference of date. At the time when the canon of the Prophets was fixed the first-mentioned books had been already hallowed by age, whereas

8 THE OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW SCHOLARSHIP

the latter were either unwritten or comparatively new. A similar argument would seem to hold good with regard to the exclusion of the prophecies of Daniel from the canon of the Prophets ; that at the time when the Prophets were canonised Daniel was either not in existence, or else not yet sufficiently hallowed by the very important test of antiquity to be admitted to that canon. In a general way the division between the Prophets and the Writings is due to difference in age, or at least this is true as between books of the same general character appearing in the two different canons. It will be evident, then, I think, from this brief sketch, that the arrangement of the Hebrew Bible possesses a considerable historical value, and may be used in helping us to determine the mutual relation of the books of the Old Testament.

At the time when the Old Testament was translated into Greek the first canon of the Hebrew Bible, the canon of the Law, had become so sacred that it was taken over as it stood, with no change in the order of the books. But this was not the case with the remainder of the Old Testament, and indeed the Old Testament as we now have it was not in existence at the time that the Septuagint translation began to be made. The Law, and the Law only, was the Bible of the Jews. The canon of the Prophets was still in flux, and the canon of the Writings was scarcely yet in sight, although most of the books composing those two canons were already in existence very much in their present form. The Septuagint translation began, as is evident, with the Law, which is supposed to have been translated by learned Greek-speaking Jews of Alexandria for the great library founded by the Ptolemies, somewhere in the first half of the third century B.C. The remaining books of the Old Testament, together with some other sacred literature, which, although it won high approval, at least for a time, was never adopted into the stricter canon of the Jews of Palestine, were translated from time to time to be added to the same royal library, the translation of the entire Septuagint Old Testament occupying in all probability more than a hundred years.

We have seen how, in the Palestinian canon, the Bible grew

by a process of accretion, in such manner that the books of the Bible outside of the Law were arranged in general in the order of their composition. A very different plan was pursued by the Alexandrian Jews, who used as their Bible the translations into Greek made for the library of the Ptolemies, including that considerable mass of material which we ordinarily designate as Apocrypha. Influenced by contact with the logical and critical-minded Greeks, they sought to arrange these books according to some scientific and critical method, as men counted scientific and critical in those days. The Law was treated as a whole, and left untouched, so far as the arrangement of the books was concerned, but the books were furnished with new titles, descriptive of their contents, and the supposed authorship was noted in the further titles —first, second, etc., book of Moses.

The Prophets and Writings were combined and rearranged in what was regarded as a rational manner. The method adopted was in general this: Those books which were regarded as historical were placed first in what was supposed to be their chronological order, so as to give a continuous history of the Jews. After these followed the non-historical books, arranged partly according to their subjects, partly according to the dates of their supposed authors. It ought to be said, however, that, so far as we know, no arrangement achieved such general agreement as to be accepted in all its details. The famous Vatican Codex, known as B, which is regarded as representing the best text, has this arrangement of the books: From Genesis to Second Esdras, which latter includes, along with much that we count apocryphal, our Book of Nehemiah, are in the order to which we are accustomed in the English Bibles; then follow Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Job, Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of the son of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit, the Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. The Codex Alexandrinus, in the British Museum, arranges the books in three volumes, as follows: In the first volume Genesis to Chronicles inclusive, in the order to which we are accustomed

in our English Bibles. In the second volume the Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, the Epistle of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther, Tobit, Judith, First and Second Esdras, and the four books of the Maccabees. The third volume contains the Psalter, together with the canticles used in the services of the Church—such as Exodus xv., the Magnificat, etc.—Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Wisdom of Solomon, and Wisdom of the son of Sirach. The Psalter of Solomon is added after the New Testament at the end of the fourth volume. But these are not the only arrangements of the books of the Old Testament which we can trace to the scholars of the Alexandrian school. Another arrangement, which is represented by Tischendorf, in his edition of the Septuagint, is as follows: Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings (two of them being what we know as First and Second Samuel), two books of Chronicles, two books of Esdras (the second including our Nehemiah), Tobit, Judith, Esther, in which, as it is found in the Septuagint, there is a considerable portion which we count apocryphal. At this point end the books counted as historical. Then follow Job, supposed to have been written by Moses; Psalms, ascribed to David; Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, and Wisdom of Solomon, supposed to have been written by Solomon; Ecclesiasticus, placed immediately after the writings of Solomon, not because of its antiquity, but because of the similarity of style and subject; the twelve Minor Prophets, the date of the earliest of which was earlier than the date of Isaiah; Isaiah; Jeremiah; Lamentations, called in the Septuagint Lamentations of Jeremiah, and attributed to that prophet as their author; the Epistle of Jeremiah; Ezekiel; Daniel, including of course the apocryphal portions; and the books of the Maccabees, which seem to have received their position apart from all the other historical books at the close of the entire canon on account of their late date. Another interesting and curious arrangement, which grew out of the methods of the Alexandrian school, is found in the Syriac Bible, viz. Pentateuch, Job, as written by Moses, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesi-

astes, Ruth, Canticles, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, Isaiah, the twelve Minor Prophets, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel.

All these various arrangements are meant, as will be seen, to be scientific, as over against the haphazard chronological order of the Hebrew. In certain points, also, all agree, as for instance in the arrangement of a section of historical books in such a manner as to carry the history of the Jews along in an orderly manner. But that I may not become tedious, I pass on to an arrangement adopted or adapted from the Alexandrian schools, which we find in the Latin Vulgate, and which is of especial interest to us and deserving of special study, because it is the arrangement adopted by the translators of the English Bible. This arrangement, as we find it in the Vulgate, is as follows: Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the four books of Kings, Chronicles, four books of Esdras, the second of which is our Book of Nehemiah, Tobit, Judith, Esther. Here ended the historical section. The remaining books were arranged in the supposed order of their composition: Job, supposed to have been written by Moses, the Psalter, ascribed to David, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs and Wisdom of Solomon, attributed to Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, placed here because of the similarity of its subject and treatment to the books immediately preceding, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the twelve Minor Prophets in the usual order, which is that of the Hebrew, and which remained unchanged in the Greek translations, because the Twelve were considered as comprising together one book, and were therefore treated as inseparable. The three books of the Maccabees were placed at the end of the whole collection and not after the historical books, to which they would seem naturally to have belonged, because the consciousness of their late date was still strong. It will be observed that the Latin Vulgate followed the Alexandrian school, not only in arranging the books in a critical and scientific manner, but also in adopting into the canon a considerable number of books which were not found in the canon of the Palestinian Jews.

It is, as already stated, the arrangement of the Latin Vulgate

which was adopted by our translators, and has now become to the mass of our people part of the Bible itself. For, while at the time of the Reformation a sharp distinction was drawn between those books which were to be found in the original Hebrew and those which existed only in the Greek translations, the Hebrew being appealed to as the original Old Testament, the order of arrangement of the Latin Bible was accepted practically without question both by the continental reformers and by the English. Those books and portions of books which were not to be found in the original Hebrew were culled out and placed by themselves as the Apocrypha, forming in our Bibles a collection intervening between the Old and the New Testaments, but further than this no attempt was made to change the order of the books adopted in the Latin Vulgate, much less to return to the original arrangement of the Hebrew Bible. It should be noticed, by the way, that the additions to the canon in the Alexandrian school belong entirely to that section of the canon which in Hebrew was known as the Writings. To several of the books of this canon, notably Esther and Daniel, large sections were added which are not to be found in the Hebrew. Besides this, entire books were added, such as Tobit and Judith, which, like Esther, naturally belong to the canon known to the Hebrews as the Writings. On the other hand, it should be noticed that the Prophets, particularly Jeremiah, are shorter in the Greek translation than in the Hebrew, a fact which bears upon the date of the composition of the canon of the Prophets.

The English Bible, then, is a translation of the original Hebrew grafted upon the form of the Latin Vulgate. It is, in other words, neither a translation of the original Hebrew, nor of the Latin Vulgate, but a compromise between the two. It has taken its words, with some exceptions, from the one, and its arrangement of the books and doctrine about those books from the other. The English Bible has distinctly incorporated into itself, as though they were part of the inspired record, the critical theories regarding the date and authorship of the books which were meant to be expressed in the

arrangement of the Latin Vulgate, the result of the higher criticism of the Alexandrian schools. Further than this, it has adopted certain titles of books, also intended to express critical views. We have seen that the Hebrew Bible designated the first five books of the Old Testament as the Law, regarding the five as one, and designating each of the five sections merely by the first word of that section. Alexandrian scholars gave to the Law the title of Pentateuch, or "five parts," and to each part a Greek name, setting it apart as a separate book, namely, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. The Jewish tradition regarding the authorship of these books, that they were written by Moses, which had, however, in the stricter Palestinian treatment of the Bible been treated as tradition and not permitted to invade the sacredly guarded realm of the text, became in the Alexandrian schools an inherent part of the books themselves, so that they were designated as the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth books of Moses, and these titles were adopted into the Vulgate. The same titles and the same statement of authorship are embodied with the books in our English translations, although not found in the original Hebrew from which our English Bibles profess to be translated. Similarly the Song of Songs received the title Song of Solomon, which is not in the original Hebrew. In other words, in these regards, as in the question of the arrangement of the books of the Old Testament, the higher criticism of the ancient Alexandrian schools has actually been incorporated in the text of the Bible of English-speaking Christians. It is a curious illustration of the manner in which the liberalism and even free-thinking of one age become the stiffest orthodoxy of some succeeding age.

It is not my intention to discuss the unfortunate results which have flowed from this confusion of critical views with the actual text of the Bible. The same sort of thing was done when Archbishop Usher's chronology was printed as a part of the Bible at the head of the pages. Every one is familiar with the mental confusion which resulted from this well-meant attempt to elucidate the Bible, and you will still find godly

and pious people, who ought to know better, telling you that the world was created 4,004 years before Christ, and appealing to their Bible in confirmation of the statement, quite unaware that their authority is in reality not the Bible, but Archbishop Usher's interpretation of the Bible. A similar result followed the attempt to make the Song of Solomon intelligible by prefixing interpretations to the chapters. People accepted these as authoritative portions of the Bible, and resented any other interpretation as heresy, because it was against the Word of God. The same result precisely has flowed from the attempt to teach doctrine about the books of the Bible by changing their order and prefixing headings not found in the original. It was done in good faith, with the honest intent to assist the understanding of the sacred book, and it represented the best scholarship of the day. It worked well as long as that scholarship held its own, just as Archbishop Usher's dates did, but the day came when that scholarship was superseded, and the scholars have found themselves ever since in conflict with the mass of the plain readers of the Bible, who naturally, not being able to refer to the original, do not distinguish between what is actually Bible and what has been put in by the critics of an earlier period in order to make the Bible more intelligible. It is all one more illustration of the fact that the Bible outlasts the traditions and the critical views of all generations.

We should emancipate the Bible from the dates of Archbishop Usher, from mystical interpretations woven into the text in the form of chapter headings, and from the critical views of Alexandrian scholars or Jewish scribes regarding the date and authorship of books as represented in the arrangement or headings of those books. Such views may be right or they may be wrong; that does not affect the question. They should not be incorporated in the text of the Bible. If they had not been so incorporated, if the text of the Bible had not been tampered with, albeit with the best and most innocent of motives, it is probable that some of those questions which now distress many Christians would not have

come to the front at all, certainly not in the present aggravated shape.

How, then, should we arrange the books of the Old Testament? Two ways are possible. The one is to endeavour to arrange the Bible as much as possible like a modern book, making it intelligible by all the devices with which we are acquainted. This would almost necessarily involve the placing of dates on the pages, the arrangement of the books according to their natural and scientific order, the putting of notices of authorship and date at the beginning of the books, and the prefixing to chapters or sections of explanatory headings. This I hold to be a desirable and legitimate method of editing the Bible, provided always it be made clear that dates, headings, etc., are not component parts of the Bible itself, of equal authority with the text. To avoid this I hold it better for the official or standard Bible to pursue the second method, which is to print just what is found in the original without comment and without rearrangement. Inasmuch as we claim in all our translations to recognise the Hebrew Old Testament as the original, the Hebrew Old Testament translated as it stands should be put into the hands of our people as the official standard Old Testament, and not the Old Testament modified by the critical theories of the Alexandrian schools, which is what we now have.

The King James translation was a great improvement on the earlier English translations which preceded it. The Canterbury Revision was in its turn an improvement on the King James version, and has brought us still nearer to the original Hebrew. In this Revision the mediæval chapter divisions have been relegated to the margin, and the verse divisions also, so that to read the Revised Version is not quite so much like reading a dictionary consecutively, as the reading of the standard King James version always has been. In other respects also, such as the heading "Song of Songs" instead of "Song of Solomon," the division of the Psalter into five books, and the recognition of poetry as poetry, translation from the Hebrew has taken the place of the former translation from

the Vulgate. But the revisers were on the whole very timid and conventional, and a great part of the objectionable departures from the original in favour of the Latin Vulgate contained in the King James still remain in the Canterbury Revision. So in famous doctrinal passages, like Isaiah vii. 14, the revisers still adhere to the Latin translation, in the face in this case of both the Greek and the Hebrew. The same timidity and dread of change shows itself in their treatment of the Pentateuch headings and the arrangement of the books. They profess to translate from the Hebrew, but in these regards they have been false to their professions, innocently but unfortunately incorporating with their Hebrew text the doctrines of the Latin Vulgate and the critical schools of ancient Alexandria. It is to be hoped that in the not far distant future we shall have an English translation that will conform in these points also to the Hebrew original. Such a translation would be an immense gain.

But I should not wish to be understood as depreciating the work of the Alexandrian scholars. They did a valuable work, and we are peculiarly indebted to them for rescuing for us the books called apocryphal, which I would like to see bound up in all Bibles between the Old and the New Testaments, and read by all men. My objection is not to the scholarship of the Alexandrian scholars, which was admirable for their age and of great service to the Church, both Jewish and Christian. That to which I object is the incorporation of the views of those uninspired men with the text of the Bible in a manner which is exceedingly misleading to the great mass of Bible readers. I wish to see the Old Testament placed in the hands of the Church as it existed among the Hebrews, with the interesting and valuable tide-marks of its growth upon it, and not as re-made according to the views of the higher critics who lived in Alexandria about two thousand years ago.

II. THE NEW TESTAMENT

Turning to the New Testament, we find in our English Bible this arrangement: First, four Gospels, then the book of

the Acts of the Apostles, then nine Epistles from St. Paul to various churches, then four Epistles from him to individuals, then an Epistle to the Hebrews ascribed to him, then seven general Epistles ascribed to James, Peter, John, and Jude, and then, last of all, the Revelation of St. John the Divine. Why are these books arranged in that order? Is it mere chance, or has it some significance? and if so, what?

If you turn to the Epistles ascribed to St. Paul, you will note that the Epistles to churches or communities of Christians, with the exception of the Epistle to the Hebrews, are placed together first. Examining these you will find that they are not arranged according to subject or date, but, odd as such a system seems to us, according to their size. Chronologically and according to topics, the present arrangement should be quite revolutionised, as anyone will have perceived who has ever undertaken to make even the most rudimentary study of the Epistles of St. Paul. The Epistles to the Thessalonians, which now stand at the end of this group, should probably stand first; then the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Romans, the Philippians, the Ephesians, the Colossians. But if these Epistles to churches and communities of Christians are arranged according to size, how is it that the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is one of the larger Epistles, stands, not only after the other Epistles to communities, but even after all the Epistles to individuals? This arrangement reflects the doubt existing regarding this Epistle from the beginning until now. The best critics of the present day do not believe that it was written by St. Paul, in which they agree with the critics of the early Church and of the Reformation period. The position of the book in our Bibles reflects the belief that it was not written by St. Paul, and therefore has no title to be placed among the Epistles written by him. But indeed the criticism of the early Church—and it was the West which particularly objected to the Epistle to the Hebrews—went even farther than this; the inspired character of the book was for a long time freely doubted, so that it was one of the last books to be admitted in the canon of the Western Church. The ground

of doubt was the question of authorship, for in early times the general opinion seems to have been that no book not written by an apostle, or under the immediate direction of an apostle, should be admitted to the canon of Holy Scripture.

A similar question was raised regarding the authorship of Second Peter and Second and Third John, and these, together with the Epistles of James and Jude, which were not written by apostles, were rejected altogether by some churches, and slowly accepted by others. It was, apparently, this question with regard to the canonicity of five out of seven of the Catholic Epistles which caused all these letters to be placed toward the end of the book, in the canon of the Western Church, after all the Epistles of St. Paul, and even after the Epistle to the Hebrews. A similar, but still more pronounced and long-continued doubt with regard to the authenticity of the Revelation of St. John the Divine, resulted in the present position of that book at the close of the whole canon.

In a general way, then, the arrangement of the books of the New Testament in our English Bibles represents the growth of the canon. The first canon to be adopted was the four Gospels, probably in the order in which they now stand. These were universally adopted, for while there were other gospels that were regarded as inspired by individual churches or by some of the fathers, these four only had from the outset the suffrages of all. About them there was never any dispute. The Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St. Paul, both those to the churches and those to individuals, were likewise accepted by all from a very early period. These writings, together with the First Epistle of St. Peter and the First Epistle of St. John, were the writings of the New Testament which were received practically from the outset by all everywhere; the remaining writings of the New Testament were long in dispute.

The latter half of the fourth century after Christ is the time which students of the canon fix as the date at which for practical purposes the canon of the New Testament may be said to have become fixed; but that does not mean that in that day

the same hard and fast lines of canonicity were drawn as at present. Indeed, for a couple of centuries after this the Greek churches rejected the Revelation of St. John the Divine, and the Syrian churches not only the Revelation, but also the Epistles of St. Jude, Second Peter, and Second and Third John, while individuals everywhere held many divergent views regarding individual books. The early Christians seem to have made freer with the Bible in many ways than we of the present day. Even as late as the middle of the sixth century Junilius, an orthodox African bishop, marks the Apocalypse, and the Epistles of James, Jude, Second Peter, and Second and Third John as books of doubtful authority.

The early reformers also showed a tendency towards a treatment of the Bible which goes beyond anything which we are ready to accept as admissible; and especially is this true of Luther. If you turn to a German Bible you will find an arrangement of the books of the New Testament which differs from our arrangement in this way: The Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistles of SS. James and Jude are taken out of their regular position and placed together after the Third Epistle and before the Revelation of St. John. In the original Lutheran Bibles a gap between the Third Epistle of St. John and the Epistle to the Hebrews further emphasised the meaning of this arrangement, which was thus explained by Luther in the Introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews: "Thus far we have had before us the well-established and main books of the New Testament. The four which here follow have long since held a lower rank." Of the Epistle to the Hebrews he further said: "There is a mixture in it of wood, hay, stubble, and it cannot be ranked side by side with the Apostolic Epistles." Of the Epistle of St. Jude he says that the ancient Church rejected it because the writer was not an apostle, and because he appealed to proverbs and stories not to be found in Holy Scripture. Of the Epistle of St. James he speaks vehemently as "an epistle of straw, which has nothing of the Bible in it." With regard to the Revelation of St. John, he says that it is not inspired by the Holy Ghost, his reasons for denying its inspiration being

because it is pervaded "through and through with visions and images, and does not prophesy with clear, plain words, like Paul and Peter and Christ Himself; because Christ is neither taught nor known in the book, and we should keep to the books wherein Christ is clearly and simply set before us." Some of the later Lutheran fathers added to these four books Second Peter and Second and Third John, regarding the whole seven as constituting an apocrypha to the New Testament, useful for reading and edification, but not to be admitted as standards of Christian doctrine. Zwingli held a somewhat similar position, rejecting the Apocalypse absolutely, and claiming that those books which were not universally received in the early Church were not to be regarded as authoritative in matters of faith, which is, indeed, the statement of our own Articles of Religion. We have no need, however, of accepting the opinion of Luther or Zwingli regarding the books at some time doubted by the Church. Nor need we follow the rule that only a book written by an apostle, or under the immediate direction of an apostle, is to be admitted into the full canon. We receive the books rather because of their contents than their authors; and the fact that there is now such a long period during which there has been a practical unanimity with regard to all the books contained in our present canon of the New Testament will justify us in asserting that the doctrine of the Catholic Church is that the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistles of James and Jude, Second Peter, Second and Third John, and the Revelation of St. John, are all inspired of the Holy Ghost and do properly belong to the canon of the inspired books of the New Testament.

I have alluded to the fact of a difference between the arrangement of the books in the Greek and in the Latin canons. I ought to add that the Latin canon is a well-fixed and definite quantity, while among the Greek churches there was considerable diversity. This is represented in the diversity of arrangement in the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament. The best known of these arrangements is that of the Alexandrian Church. Now the Alexandrian Church, in both

the New and Old Testament canons, shows a tendency to take in the greatest possible number of books, differing in this quite distinctly from the Greek churches in Palestine, Asia Minor, and elsewhere. Tischendorf's edition of the Greek New Testament, which reflects the Alexandrian arrangement, orders the books thus: Four Gospels, Acts, Catholic Epistles (James, First and Second Peter, First, Second, and Third John, Jude), Epistles of St. Paul to the churches, Hebrews, Epistles to individuals, and Apocalypse. This arrangement reflects the scientific or would-be scientific character of Alexandrian Bible scholars. They were in their way the "higher critics" of the early Church. They were not content to have the books of the New Testament arranged according to the order in which they were adopted, which is practically the plan pursued in the Latin arrangement and, following that, in our English translations of the Bible, but sought to adopt a scientific scheme which should exhibit the relation of the books to one another, their authorship, etc. Accordingly, accepting the Epistle to the Hebrews as Pauline, they incorporated it among the Pauline Epistles and placed it along with the Epistles of St. Paul to the churches. (There are even indications that it was sometimes placed in Alexandrian manuscripts after the Epistle to the Galatians.) Similarly the Catholic Epistles received a position directly after the Acts, on the theory that they antedate the Pauline Epistles, and therefore, for purposes of reading and study, should precede those Epistles.

In making a scientific arrangement of the books of the New Testament at the present day, we should scarcely be willing to accept this Alexandrian arrangement; for the higher criticism of the present day, while having in view the same object as that of the old Alexandrian scholars, to understand the Bible better and make it more intelligible to the world, has learned much which they did not know. If we must choose between the Vulgate arrangement and that of the Alexandrian critics, probably the former is to be preferred, since it gives us in a manner the history of the growth of the

canon. But it should be understood that the arrangement of the books of the New Testament is not a part of the inspired record, and no particular arrangement can be regarded as obligatory on any Church. Why should we not, therefore, have for the purposes of our ordinary use an arrangement which shall, as far as possible, help to make the books intelligible? Why did not the Canterbury Revisers attempt something of this sort? Those good, and in many cases wise men, were very curious combinations of thorough scholarship and timid adherence to what had been, because it had been. They did away with the dictionary plan of printing the Bible, which is a serious hindrance to its intelligent reading, substituting the principle of paragraph divisions according to the sense, for the old method of division into verses on no principles of sense, but for convenience of reference of scribes. Now if they could venture to use common sense in such a matter as this, why did they feel it necessary to continue to arrange St. Paul's Epistles according to size? Is there any special virtue in such an arrangement? Was the scribe who first fixed them in that order an inspired man? To my mind he was very much the opposite, and there is no reason why we should perpetuate such confusion for all time, and make common, plain people think that it is inspired because it is in the Bible. The special object of a translation of the Bible for ordinary use should be to make that Bible thoroughly plain to the people. I should be very sorry to see the Canterbury revision accepted as it stands, as the Bible of the Church, not because it is not a great improvement on the King James version, for it is that, but because to adopt it now would be to stereotype a considerable number of sins, not merely against scholarship, but against common sense, by which the reading and understanding of the Bible would be hindered for a long time to come. It is better to keep the matter in a state of flux until we can get something better than either the King James or the Canterbury translations.

What sort of an arrangement of the books of the New Testament would best serve the purpose of making that

inspired volume most intelligible? I have made special mention of the Pauline Epistles because the present arrangement of those Epistles is the most objectionable part of the arrangement of the whole New Testament. Think of arranging a series of letters merely according to their size, without any reference either to date or subject-matter! The rearrangement of these letters in general according to their date would accomplish the end desired. Outside of this the difficulties to be overcome are somewhat greater, and the limits of this chapter will scarcely permit me to go into any detailed explanations and suggestions.

The points to emphasise are these: No properly prescribed order of arrangement of the books of the New Testament has come down to us; our present arrangement is that of the Latin Church, which, while historically interesting on account of its testimony concerning the growth of the canon, is, after all, a sort of chance concurrence of atoms, priority in order depending within certain limits on priority of undisputed admission to the canon; the arrangement of the Alexandrian Church, which is that in use in our ordinary Greek New Testaments, is the result of an attempt on the part of the Alexandrian critics to arrange the books of the Bible according to scientific principles which we no longer recognise as scientific, and is not, therefore, an arrangement which we should do well to imitate; the arrangement of Luther, on the other hand, is based on certain private interpretations of that great man which we should scarcely be prepared to accept and embalm in the arrangement of our canon. What we need is a conservative, common-sense arrangement, which shall help people to understand what they read, and which shall represent what is generally admitted, but shall not attempt under the guise of the Bible to foist private opinions of any individuals or schools on the Church with authority. It ought not to be impossible to make such an arrangement of the books of the New Testament.

CHAPTER II

THE BIBLE, THE CHURCH, AND REASON

ARTICLE VI. of the Articles of Religion is headed, "Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation." The body of the Article defines this sufficiency thus: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." In other words, the object of the Article is to confute the Roman position, which placed the unwritten on a par with the written tradition of the Church as contained in Holy Scripture, exacting as a condition of salvation belief in things which were not contained in Holy Scripture. The definition is exclusive and not inclusive. It excludes from the things necessary to be believed "whatsoever is not read" in Holy Scripture, "nor may be proved thereby," but does not state what things contained therein must be believed. By inference this is done to some extent in the eighth Article, "Of the Creeds": "The Nicene Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." And yet it would be erroneous to say that the authors of these Articles intended to limit belief to the statements of the Creeds. The object of the eighth Article was not to state a minimum of belief, beyond which no one was bound to go, but to assert the credibility of the Creeds, because they have "certain warrants of Holy Scripture." The inspiration and the credibility of Holy Scripture are

assumed as an axiom, as a foundation on which everything else must rest. Holy Scripture is the constitution from which all propositions derive their validity and by which they must be tested. That is the attitude of the Articles of Religion toward the Bible.

But on the other hand, the Articles of Religion, while not attempting to give any formal definition of inspiration, evidently do not regard all Scripture as of equal validity, nor even as "an infallible rule of faith and practice." The seventh Article distinctly states, in the form of a conditional sentence, as something recognised by all, that the Law was defective, temporary, and fallible, so that Christian men are no longer bound by the ceremonies and rites ordained in that law, nor need the civil precepts thereof be received in any community. That Article closes with these words: "Yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral." In other words, according to this Article, part of the Old Testament is temporary and fallible, and part is eternal and infallible. There are two elements in combination in the Old Testament: the one has an historical value; it has been serviceable; it has been of use in bringing men to the truth; but it is outgrown now—men have got beyond it; it is no longer true; the other is true in its very nature—it can never be outgrown, and it is as binding on us to-day as it was on the Hebrews in the remotest antiquity. According to the doctrine not only of our own Church, but substantially of all Christians, the ceremonial and ritual law of the Old Testament has no more validity for us than the ceremonial and ritual laws of the Phœnicians, and the civil precepts of the Hebrew codes are no more binding upon us than the laws of Solon. The reason assigned for this in the Articles of Religion is, as shown by the last clause of the seventh Article, that they are not moral in their character. That which is essentially true, and therefore binding at all times on all men of all nations, is "the Commandments which are called Moral."

But what are these moral commandments, and on what principles are they to be determined? Are they moral because of the external authority by which they are ordained, or are they moral because of something inherent in themselves? And if the latter, how is that something to be determined? There is a tendency on the part of many Christian theologians, born of the profound belief in the absolute depravity of the human race, the utter incapacity of the child to be taken into the counsels of its parent and be governed by reason and love, the belief that it must be held aloof and governed by unexplained commands enforced by the rod of discipline, to determine the moral commands on the basis of external authority. The Decalogue is set off by itself as given in a special sense by God, written by His own finger on tables of stone. But if the basis on which it is determined that the commandments of the Decalogue are the moral commandments be merely the basis of external authority, an external command from God, then it would seem that we cannot stop with the Decalogue, and that the great bulk of the civil, ceremonial, and ritual precepts of the Pentateuch could claim a similar authority as the dicta of God Himself, which could not be disregarded without discrediting the Almighty; for these laws also are declared to be spoken by God, and there is no indication in the context that they are temporary in their application any more than the laws of the Decalogue. In point of practice, moreover, all Christians, with the exception of one infinitesimally small sect, have recognised that the commandments of the Decalogue are not exclusively moral, and are consequently not binding throughout. The Fourth Commandment was thrown out at an early date by the Christian Church as a provision of Jewish ritual, not binding on the Christian. And to this day, with the exception of the Seventh Day Baptists, no body of Christians keeps the seventh day as a Sabbath day of rest to the Lord. They may attempt to posit their observance of the first day on a moral obligation to rest unto God one-seventh of the time, implied in the Fourth Commandment; nevertheless, the fact remains that

they do not observe the Fourth Commandment, and that they treat it as a commandment of ritual not obligatory on them to keep the “seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” Neither do they abstain from all manner of work on the first day of the week, even when they call that day the Sabbath day, they “nor their sons nor their daughters,” much less “their menservants nor their maidservants,” and very often not their cattle. The Fourth Commandment is not placed in practice on a plane with the other commandments ; it is treated as a ritual commandment, in which may lurk a moral obligation, but which is, nevertheless, in itself ritual and ceremonial. But the Jews regarded this commandment as of equal obligation with the others ; and in the period after the Exile it assumed an importance, if possible, above the others as a fundamental principle of religion, the breach of which was far worse than theft, for instance, and to be punished more severely both here and hereafter.

Turning to the words of our Lord in the New Testament, we do not find Him taking the position that the commandments of the Decalogue had a special character derived from authority, placing them on a different plane from the remainder of the Old Testament. Indeed, when He is asked what is God’s highest revelation of Himself in the Law, He does not refer to these commandments as a whole, or to any one of them separately, but quotes from Deuteronomy vi. 5 : “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind,” asserting that this is “the first and great commandment.” “And the second commandment,” which “is like unto it,” He quotes from Leviticus xix. 18, where,—mixed in with civil, ritual, and ceremonial laws, so that the laws which immediately follow it read : “Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind : thou shalt not sow thy field with two kinds of seed : neither shall there come upon thee a garment of two kinds of stuff mingled together,”—stand the words: “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” As over against authority our Lord appeals in His answer to the lawyer to the moral sense of the

man himself. The sweet reasonableness of His statement is its proof. It is not because He says it, it is not because it rests on some external authority that it is convincing—it is because it is true. The morality of it is recognised by the moral sense of the man ; the divine in the man recognises the divinely inspired truth when it is presented to him. The statement in the seventh Article brings us, then, logically to this, that the commandments which are moral, and to which every Christian man owes obedience, are to be recognised by their morality appealing to the moral nature within us, or in other words, to our reason. Mere external authority cannot settle the question, for even in the Decalogue itself there are, combined with the immutable and infallible moral elements, other elements which the practically unanimous voice of the Christian Church has declared to be ritual and ceremonial, and therefore not binding on Christians, mutable and fallible. On the other hand, embedded in the midst of laws principally of a ceremonial character, stand those utterances which, as our Lord pointed out, are eternally true, and constitute the highest verbal revelation which we have received from God.

Now this seventh Article, as stated in its heading, deals only with the Old Testament, but the principle which it establishes cannot be confined to the Old Testament. It is a general principle, applicable to the New Testament as well. If, with our Lord, we base our determination of what is eternal and binding in the Old Testament not on external authority, but on the inherent truthfulness of the thing itself—and He did so, not merely in the instance above cited, but wheresoever in His teaching there was occasion to do so, so that, for example, He deliberately rejected the law of divorce as contained in the Mosaic codes, pronouncing it to be not consonant to the law of God, and appealing against the authority of the law of Moses to the answer of the enlightened consciences of men ; He rejected the Pentateuchal law of retaliation as contrary to the divine law of love as witnessed by the consciences of men ; and where He cites the Scriptures in proof of His words, as He loves to do, He appeals through

and beyond them to the truth of God as witnessed in the consciences of the sons of God, so that it was said of Him that He "taught as one having authority and not as the scribes"—if, with Him, we base our determination of what is eternal, true, and binding in the Old Testament not on external authority, but on the inherent truth of the thing itself, we have established a general principle which is applicable to the New Testament also, and even to the words and deeds of our Lord Himself. We have laid down the principle of the appeal to reason. Facts of history and truths of religion in the Bible, as elsewhere, must be settled finally by the appeal to the reasons and consciences of men. Now in practice this is universally recognised. No one thinks he is going to convert anyone to Christianity except by an appeal to his reason and his conscience. We translate the Bible, and spread it abroad, that the reasonableness and the inherent truth of it may appeal to the hearts and minds of men. We write apologies to show the truth of Christ, to prove to the reasons and consciences of men that He had the very truth of God. It is a premise on which our whole practice is founded, that reason and conscience are the ultimate judges of the truth.

But in theory this is not always recognised, and we are told that the Bible or the Church, and not reason, must be the ultimate judge of the truth of any proposition. What should be the position of the Bible and the Church in relation to reason? Does not the statement that reason is the ultimate judge of the truth deny the inspiration, and hence divine authority of the Bible, and place it on a par with other books? And does it not, on the other hand, destroy the authority of the Church, setting up private judgment in the place of Catholic truth, and putting a premium on the multiplication of sects? Let us see what are the relations to one another of private judgment and the judgment of the Church in this matter. The Church antedates the Bible; the Church gave the Bible to the world. It did not do this, however, by appointing a commission to write a Bible, or even to decide

what books should form the Bible. This book appealed to the hearts and minds of Christian men in this place, and was recognised by them as bringing them a message from God ; that book appealed to men in another place. There were many histories of our Lord's life written. Little by little the general consensus of Christian opinion selected four Lives (if the Gospel of St. John can properly be called a Life of Christ Jesus) from all these as worthy of a special place in the use and worship of the Church. St. Paul wrote many letters ; of which in course of time a few came to be held in special reverence as possessing a permanent message of God to the Church. At first the same books were not held in honour in all the churches. But little by little, as the result of the experience, not of one age nor one nation, but of many generations through all the world, a reasonable consensus of opinion was reached as to the books which constitute Holy Scripture, which are inspired of God for the guidance and instruction of man. Men found that these books had a special message to their hearts and reasons from their Father in Heaven which no other books had. These books exercised a peculiar influence on the minds and lives of men. Now there were books quite outside of the Bible that exercised this influence on particular individuals or groups of individuals, or even on particular ages, as witness the influence of the Book of Enoch, quoted as Holy Scripture in the Epistle of St. Jude, and adopted into the canon of at least one national Church as inspired ; or the position of the Pastor of Hermas in the second century. Think of the influence of Thomas à Kempis' *Imitation* ; of the *Te Deum*, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, etc. And there are, in the experience of us all, books outside of the Bible which exercise such an influence on individuals or groups of individuals at the present day. Those books do not come into the Bible for the reason that experience has not shown that they have those qualities which enable them to exercise this influence, not merely on a few individuals or on the individuals of one generation, but on all sorts and conditions of men through generation after generation. The

judgment of the Church is nothing more than the consensus of the private judgments of those that constitute the Church—Christian believers now as well as in the earlier centuries, and then as well as now. It is the eternal truth of the books of the Bible, as testified to by the universal consent of the Church throughout the ages, which leads us to set them aside from other books. As we have found that they have uplifted and inspired men through all these ages, so we conclude that they will continue to do the same through the ages that are yet to come. But this does not mean to say that each book has had a message for each individual soul, nor even for each age. Probably no one individual finds each book inspired to him. Possibly he finds some book not in the Bible inspired to him above anything that is in the Bible. If his individual experiences in this matter were to become the universal experience of Christian men through a series of ages, then that book would be added to the Bible, because the Church would have proved by experience that it was inspired. With regard to the Bible, the Church simply testifies to a fact of experience, when it testifies that these books are holy writings. It has collected together those books of which it has made this experience. It hands them to the individual Christian to study for proof of the truth which it teaches. So far as he himself is concerned, he cannot help using his private judgment in the study of these books, if he would. The Church Catholic knows from experience that this collection of books is inspired; and therefore it knows that, all things being as they ought to be, a man of well-balanced heart and mind, exercising his private judgment in its study, will recognise this inspiration, and that the more deeply and thoroughly he studies the Bible the more profoundly will he believe in its inspiration. It challenges the critical study of these books as other books are studied, the investigation of their testimony for themselves and for the doctrine inculcated, as all other testimony is investigated. It does not suppose that each book will appeal in the same way or the same degree to the life of each individual; it does not claim that each book

will be found infallible in all its parts ; but it does know that these books are and will always be found to be holy writings, inspired of God. In actual practice there is no conflict in this matter between the true idea of the authority of the Holy Catholic Church and the right of private judgment. The judgment of the Church is the consensus of the private judgments of the individuals who compose that Church—of all the saints. It is a composite photograph in which each Christian is included, but it is not a private photograph of each individual Christian.

And now as to the multiplication of sects. It is true that the multiplication of sects is due to the abuse of private judgment, but in quite a different direction. It is due to the abuse of private judgment on the part of individuals, groups of individuals, and generations, who have undertaken to saddle Holy Scripture with a talmud, or interpretation, representing their own private judgment of what that Scripture ought to mean.

This brief notice of the testimony of the Church to the Holy Scriptures would be incomplete if we did not also say a word about the testimony of the Church to the different value or holiness of the different parts of Holy Scripture. Every intelligent reader finds that there is a great difference in the amount of divine truth contained in the different books of the Bible, and the Church as a whole testifies to the same fact as the result of the experience of its individual members. The Jewish Church did not place all parts of the Old Testament on the same plane, and the Christian Church has made the same experience. The Christian Church regards the Old Testament as distinctly inferior in its inspiration to the New, and so strongly has this been felt to be the case, so wide does the moral gap between parts of the Old Testament and the doctrine of Jesus Christ seem to be, that at times there has been on the part of some an inclination to throw the Old Testament aside altogether as contrary to the New, or as transitory in its character ; opinions to which reference is made in the seventh Article of the Articles of Religion. Again,

there are some books in the New Testament which have been seriously questioned at one time or another. The book of Revelation, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and some of the Catholic Epistles were long refused admission to the Holy Scripture in various parts of the ancient Church. There are, furthermore, books which were at one time received as Holy Scripture by some part of the Catholic Church, but which are now rejected, and there are books which are now accepted as Holy Scripture by one part of the Church and rejected by another. The limits of the canon, at its lower end, are somewhat ill defined. But while this is intensely annoying to those theorists who have some private doctrine about the inspiration of Holy Scripture and the origin of the Bible, it is not in fact confusing to the person who realises what Holy Scripture is, and goes to it for what it contains. About the bulk of the books there has never been any real doubt, because their spiritual eminence is so clear. They would give us, if by any misfortune we were ever deprived of the other books, all the historical and doctrinal facts which are essential. There are other books in which the human element, if I may so express myself, the temporary and mutable, is more prominent. For along with the eternal and immutable in each book there is a temporal and mutable element. These elements are combined in different proportions ; and as the proportion of the eternal and immutable diminishes, so the claim of the book to what we call inspiration, to be regarded as a Holy Writing, diminishes. But at what point shall we say that inspiration ceases ? that the proportion of the mutable to the immutable is so large that we can no longer call the book holy ? That is a question to be decided by the experience of the Church rather than by theory. In practice it is pertinent with regard to the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, which is placed by the Roman Church in the Bible, thrown out of the Bible altogether by the extreme Protestants, and placed half in it half out of it by the Greek Church, as well as by our own Church, as being, as our sixth Article has it, good to read "for example of life and instruction

of manners," but not to be applied "to establish any doctrine."

Now there are some to whom such statements as these, although founded on the Bible itself, on the history of the Church, and on those doctrinal statements which possess most authority among us, will seem to be subversive in some way of the doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible, and to place that book on a par with other books. These men seek to safeguard the sanctity of the Bible by such statements as this: The books of Scripture "are one and all, in thought and verbal expression, in substance and form, wholly the Word of God, conveying with absolute accuracy and divine authority, all that God meant them to convey, without human additions or admixtures." Or, again, "All written under it [the Divine influence called inspiration] is the very Word of God, of infallible truth and of divine authority; and this infallibility and authority attach as well to the verbal expression in which the revelation is conveyed as to the matter of the revelation itself." Again, we are told that "the Scriptures contain no errors," and that if it could be proved that there are any errors in matters of physical science, or any "erroneous statements and contradictory accounts in the Holy Scriptures, their plenary inspiration must be renounced." I have been quoting from the Presbyterian talmud, written by the learned scribes of the law who sit among the Presbyterians in Moses' seat. And they have done just what the scribes of our Lord's day did; they have so overlaid the law with their interpretation of it that the law itself is lost. Now the conception of Divinity has been a conception of something remote from the human, surrounded with clouds and thick darkness, revealed in thunderings, lightnings, and portents. It is this conception of Divinity which is represented in every heathen religion, and even in official Judaism, although there were those among the prophets who had a vision of something truer and better. The same false conception of God, followed out in another direction, has led men to seek to make their sacred books sacred by wrapping them about with awe and wonder, with

theories of their divinity, and with *talmuds*, or teachings, through which only men should be allowed to approach them. They must not be handled like other books ; the same canons of criticism must not be applied to them which are applied to other books. If you would learn to know the Veda, you must go to the Brahmins, and ask them to interpret it according to their traditions and doctrines. It is profanation to study it as you study other books. The very language in which it is written is holy. It is itself, not merely the Word of God, but the very brain of God. The Moslems say almost the same thing of the Koran ; the scribes of our Lord's day said the same thing of the Law of Moses ; and, unfortunately, some Christians have undertaken to teach the same thing about our Scriptures of both Old and New Testaments. Now if the Bible is no better than the Veda or the Koran, well and good ; let us treat it in the same way in which Brahmins and Moslems treat their sacred books, and shield it and guard it, and hedge about its divinity, for fear men should examine it too closely and find that there is none there. On the other hand, if we believe that the Bible is really different from these other books of the nations ; that it stands on a far higher plane ; unique, needing no concealment and no bolstering up with traditions and doctrines, as those other books do, let us lay it down open before the world, and challenge men to read, study, and examine it with all the critical apparatus which they use in the study of other books.

As a practical fact we cannot do anything else unless we would stultify ourselves, for we have said to the adherents of every other religion—to Brahmins and Buddhists, and Moslems and Confucianists and whatever else besides—give us your proofs, and let us test them in the light of reason, according to the reasonable methods by which we examine other books, whether professing to be records of historical fact, statements of scientific truth, philosophical speculations, or ethical teaching. You say these books are divine ; prove it. Give your books open to the jury of the world. Let the critics scrutinise them, analyse them, criticise them

according to the canons of modern criticism, by which they criticise all books. And so we must lay the Bible open before the jury of the world, and bid it scrutinise, analyse, criticise the Bible according to the same canons of criticism which it applies to the Veda, the Koran, and other so-called holy books. The man who really believes in the inspiration of the Bible ought not to be afraid of such a test.

But, furthermore, this method of treating the Bible is in fact the Divine method, as over against the heathen method pursued by the Brahmins, Moslems, and the like, and unfortunately also by some Christians, who would hide their Scriptures in the thick clouds of foreign tongues and traditional interpretations, and protect their sanctity by the fulmination of doctrinal anathemas. As over against the false ideas of God presented by other religions, Christianity presents the idea of a present and loving God, Who reveals Himself to man in man. This is the very foundation-stone of the Christian religion—that God revealed Himself to man in a Man made like men, cast down to struggle side by side with men. This God-Man did not strike little children dead when they offended Him in their play; nor did the water in which His swaddling clothes were washed work miracles. That is the nonsense of apocryphal gospels, in which men not inspired by the Spirit of God vainly sought to magnify the Divinity of Jesus Christ, but, as the Church recognised, did really profane and debase that Divinity in the attempt, so that all such tales were soon relegated to the lumber-room of silly and godless fables. He did not come turning the stones to bread to feed Himself; He did not come a king to whom all the kingdoms of the earth were given and the riches thereof; He did not come descending in clouds, upborne by angels. Those were the suggestions of the devil with regard to the nature of God, the ideas of the lower, bestial, devilish nature concerning Divinity and the manifestation of Divinity. The real Divinity was manifested in quite a contrary manner, in the helpless Babe of Bethlehem; in the lowly Carpenter of Nazareth; in the poor, wandering, loving, suffering Teacher that had not

where to lay His head ; in the blameless Convict, despised, outcast, executed on Calvary. His Divinity was not manifested by a nimbus about His head, by external phenomena, by place and power, but by something inherent in Himself, by perfect love and truth. And there is the keynote of the whole system—Divinity in humanity. Dehumanise Jesus of Nazareth, and you profane His Divinity. Dehumanise the Bible, which tells about Him, and you profane its divinity.

But I do not mean to put the Bible on a par with Jesus of Nazareth. It is the written witness which the Church lays before the world to substantiate its claim that He is the Saviour of the world. But there are certain definitions of the Bible which have been current at one time or another, or are even now current among some groups of Christians, which in their anxiety to emphasise the sacred character of the Holy Scriptures have put those Scriptures in the place of Christ. In a loose, general way we may say that the Bible is the Word of God, as we do say, for instance, in several places in our Prayer Book ; but to say in theological definition, as the second Helvetic Confession does, that “the Holy Scriptures are the very Word of God,” or that “all written under it [the Divine influence called inspiration] is the very Word of God, of infallible truth and of divine authority,” as do those Presbyterian divines whom I have quoted, is rank heresy, for it degrades Jesus Christ, placing a written book in His place. The doctrine of the New Testament, and the doctrine of the Catholic Church is that Jesus Christ, and He only, is the very Word of God, the only full, perfect, and complete utterance of Himself to man by God. The Bible is the written evidence of the fact that Jesus Christ is the very Word of God, true, perfect, and infallible. But the Bible is not itself that Word. If the infallible Word of God could have been revealed through imperfect and fallible men, like Moses and the prophets, it would have been so revealed. As the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews puts it (viii. 7), “For if that first covenant had been faultless, then would

no place have been sought for a second." The infallible Word of God could be revealed only through the perfect Man, Jesus the Christ, who is the very Word of God. The Bible is the written evidence which the Church presents to the world to prove that He is in fact that Word, and it is sufficient for that purpose, and is inspired for that purpose. The Church, inspired by the Spirit of the living God, is itself the living witness to the truth of that Word.

CHAPTER III

THE INCARNATION AND THE NEWER CRITICISM

THERE is at present a somewhat panicky attitude with regard to the supposed hostility of the newer criticism to the doctrine of the Incarnation. It is natural that when anything new is introduced it should be watched with much suspicion, and it is certain that in theological circles this will always be the case. Doctors and lawyers and scientists look with more or less distrust on all new theories, because the new involves the removal of a part at least of the old and the upsetting of ideas and practices and customs. Theology is much more conservative than even medicine, or law, or science, because the theologian feels that he is dealing with things infinitely more important than astronomy, or geology, or botany, or medicine, or law. Now, whenever a new theory is presented with regard to anything, it is difficult at first to determine exactly what its ultimate effects will be, and consequently the most singular mistakes are often made in dealing with new theories, those who should be their natural friends sometimes becoming, through misunderstanding, their deadliest foes, and *vice versa*. In point of fact, the newer criticism lays its special emphasis on the Incarnation ; you might almost say that it is a protest against a prevalent but ancient disbelief in the Incarnation.

Men of that school or tendency of thought, often called the Newer Criticism, or the Higher Criticism, if they were to define their position as over against the position of the traditionalists, might well take as their text our Lord's declara-

tion of the method of God's revelation of Himself to man in answer to the temptations in the wilderness. The common human conception of God is of something awful and miraculous, bursting out in lightning and thunder, manifesting itself in startling breaches of the law of nature. God should show Himself as God by turning the stones into bread, by casting Himself down from a pinnacle in the temple, and floating into the gaping crowd beneath in glory, surrounded by hosts of angels. That is the common human conception of the incarnation of God. To this Jesus opposes the conception of the Son of Man. The Son of God is equally the Son of Man—perfect Man. He lives the life of ordinary men; He eats and drinks as they do; He suffers as they do; He is subject to the natural human desires and passions; He is made in all respects such as we are, the only exception being that He does not fail to live up to the standard of His being. He realises the full possibilities of His Manhood, and is without sin. Now, this conception of a revelation of God was opposed to the commonly received ideas among the Jews at that time, and opposed to the common ideas of men in general. The Jews regarded Sinai as the representative of the highest revelation of God to man. God is hidden away in clouds and darkness; the thunder and lightning reveal His presence; the mountain on which His glory rests is so holy that if one do but touch it he shall die. So awful is God that the sight of Him, or even the near approach to His presence, must produce death. The Pharisees demanded of our Lord some sign, some manifestation of miraculous power as an evidence of His Divinity. He always and invariably refused to give such a sign. It is a temptation of the devil. That is not the true and highest revelation of God to man. The highest revelation of God to man must be made in man himself, developed to the perfection of his manhood, sinless and holy.

The same problem which perplexed the Pharisees with regard to this Man who claimed to be divine perplexed the Christians of a later day. In the docetic Gospel of St. Peter,

a partial text of which was so strangely recovered from an Egyptian tomb not long since, we find these ideas expressing themselves in an anti-human representation of Christ. His human form was a mere appearance, the divine was the reality ; and the divine is so opposed to and so different from the human, that it must be the case that it manifested itself in wonderful and startling phenomena. This was the line of reasoning which produced the docetic Gospel of St. Peter, and many other writings of a far more extravagant character.

There was no intention of telling that which is untrue, there was a most sincere desire to tell the truth ; but doctrine, preconceived notions, colour everything that such writers tell about our Lord. They start with a fundamental doctrine of divinity as something anti-human, and whenever they come to anything in the narrative of our Lord's life which represents Him simply as a man, they modify it in accordance with that doctrine which they believe to be true.

The same general conception of Divinity lies at the bottom of the gnostic heresies. The idea of Divinity which found expression in the Indian cosmogonies represents God as something infinitely removed from man and the world, and even from all action. Creation itself is a process which cannot proceed directly from the Almighty, because He has no needs, no wants, and exercises no activities ; and the effort of such systems is to account for creation and the world with as little contradiction of this fundamental and fundamentally false conception of God as possible. As the next best thing to denying absolutely all connexion between God and creation, they separate the two by unending æons, and remove Him from direct contact with the world by the supposition of emanation upon emanation. This Indian theory is also, in so far, the gnostic theory. Almighty God is infinitely removed from the world and all concern in the activities of man. The direct manifestation of Himself to man in human form is inconceivable. Divinity is manifested, it is true, but this Divinity is infinitely removed from the Eternal All.

Although these docetic and gnostic views were pronounced

heretical by the Church, yet because they contained a conception of Divinity which is, one might say, common to the race, therefore we find the condemned heresies exercising a very great modifying influence upon the thought of the Christian Church. Unconsciously, popular theology first, and afterwards the theology of theologians, adopted into itself a certain portion of that docetic conception which, theologically interpreted, denies the complete Humanity of our Lord. The Bible itself states that He was born of a pure virgin, conceived of the Holy Ghost and not of man. Not content with this statement of the division of our Lord's nature, by which He was equally God and Man, born of both alike, a tendency soon manifested itself to exalt and magnify the mother of Jesus into Divinity, thus denying in fact, if not in formal doctrine, the perfect Humanity of the nature of our Lord.

The various heathen worships which were absorbed into Christianity at one place or another tended to help forward the deification of the Virgin. Everywhere there had been an inclination, especially everywhere in the East, to worship the Divinity in a bi-sexual way; where there was a god, there was also a goddess. The half-converted heathen who entered the Christian Church found in the worship of the Virgin that worship of the female half of Divinity to which they were used in their own religions. This, as I have said, had its effect, and a very great effect, upon the theology of the Christian Church, until at last you find in the dark and middle ages, in popular theology at least, the Virgin Mary exalted into heaven itself. Jesus is no longer the Son of the pure Virgin of Nazareth, but the Son of the great goddess, queen of heaven. The final theological assertion of this doctrine on the part of the Roman Catholic Church did not take place, it is true, until the latter half of the nineteenth century, when the Pope promulgated as a doctrine of the Church the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, thus removing our Lord's connexion with humanity one step back; in gnostic language placing another æon or

emanation between God and man. But in promulgating this doctrine the Pope only put into theological form the actual popular belief of the Church of the Middle Ages, which is in most particulars the belief of the Church of Rome of to-day.

The Reformers of the sixteenth century resisted this Romish doctrine of the divinity of the Virgin Mary; nevertheless, a large element of the docetic conception which lay behind the deification of the Virgin embodied itself in the ordinarily received Protestant theology. This showed itself particularly in the treatment of the Bible. It has been exceedingly difficult for the theologians to grasp the full significance of the revelation of God's Word in Jesus of Nazareth. There is no doubt in their minds of His Divinity, the doubt is about the human side of His nature; and if they have not fully realised this, much less have they realised the human side in the written and imperfect word, which in their theology has been put in the place of the incarnate Word of God.

To turn back to our Lord's temptations, to which I have referred before, we find that He asserts that that idea of the manifestation of the Divinity, which is represented in the Old Testament by the story of the theophany at Sinai, where the Law was given in the midst of clouds and darkness and dread, is not the highest, perhaps I should rather say is not the correct idea of the manifestation of God. He who is very God shall not be manifested by casting Himself from the pinnacle of the temple upborne by clouds of angels; neither shall all kingdoms of the earth see in Him a temporal master before whom they shall bow themselves in submission; neither shall His touch turn the stones about Him into bread; but He, the very God, shall be manifested in very man, and the evidence of His Divinity, the outshining of His glory, shall be the perfection of the divine attributes in man, the attributes of love and truth. According to our Lord's teaching, and as the necessary outcome of His example in the revelation of Himself to man, we are forced to the conclusion of the

imperfection, the inadequateness, and the humanness of all former manifestations ; that is, that these manifestations of God, being represented to us through human agencies, have been coloured with the lower and human ideas. No man ever saw God except the Son of Man in whom God was revealed, and when men thought that they saw or knew Him they saw Him after all only through their own human imperfections ; their understanding of God was biased by their own human imaginings.

Our Lord represents the perfect Man ; all that had gone before was but the child growing to the man. The relation of the Old Testament history and of the life of Israel to our Lord was the relation of the child to the full-grown man. The same consciousness, the same personality is there from birth until it reaches its maturity in perfect Israel, the divine Son of Man ; but, unless we are prepared to deny the perfect Divinity of our Lord in fact, if not in name, we must admit that the relation of this growing divine personality throughout the old dispensation to the completed Divine Personality in the revelation of God in Jesus Christ was that of the child to the man. There were not two complete men. You cannot take the Law or the Prophets and interpret them as divine in the sense in which you interpret the words and acts of our Lord as divine, without belittling and denying the uniqueness of His Divinity. But this is precisely what Protestant theology practically did in placing the Old Testament on an equality with the New, and in placing the words of the followers of our Lord, as handed down to us in the Acts and Epistles, upon an equality with His words, or even in placing anything that has come down to us through the agency of other men, as the interpreters or exponents of His teaching, upon an equality with Himself.

Israel of the Old Testament stood related to Christ of the New Testament as you and I as children stand related to ourselves as men, and we must interpret the history of the Old Testament, its statements about God and the Word of God, as we, looking back over our own lives, would now interpret

our own earlier conceptions of God and of things in the spiritual world. Let me illustrate what I mean by a very simple example of my own childish imaginings. The North Pole, when I was a little boy, was a pole on an observatory at Fort Lee on the Hudson River. This pole was as nearly as possible north from the point at which I usually saw it. I suppose my father had indicated it to me sometime as an object by which I could tell the direction of north ; but, however that may be, having come to know that that did indicate the direction of north, I had very naturally connected the word "pole," which I had heard in statements about the North Pole, with the pole on this observatory, which appeared to be due north from me, and during my early boyhood I supposed in consequence that that was the North Pole. Here is a connexion of spiritual or intangible fact with an outward material phenomenon of a merely accidental nature. If I had written down as a boy that the North Pole was visible from the river bank just below my house, and that the North Pole stood on the bluff above Fort Lee, anyone reading it would say, "Why, that is a childish conception of a real fact. He has grasped the fundamental truth that that direction is north, but his horizon is not sufficiently large to enable him to understand that the North Pole is more than a thousand miles away from that pole ; nor has he the development of abstract reasoning which enables him to conceive of the pole as merely a theoretical point instead of an actual outward and visible fact." Now, just as you have noted great differences in the conceptions of the Old Testament, just so are there differences of conception of spiritual things according to the growth and development of the man. When I became a big boy the pole on the Fort Lee Observatory had ceased to be the North Pole ; so also Israel grew in its perceptions of truth from infancy to youth.

I have tried to state certain fundamental principles which lie behind the whole movement which has often been designated as the Newer Criticism. I do not mean that every one who dabbles in higher criticism is always conscious of these

basal ideas or aware that he is affected by them ; and I admit, on the other hand, that a great many persons who hold up their hands in holy horror at the mention of higher criticism have grasped in reality this underlying doctrine of Incarnation, although they have not followed it out to its logical consequences in the interpretation of the Bible. The application of higher criticism in the study of the scriptures of both the Old and the New Testaments is a logical outcome of a true conception of the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ. Higher criticism means nothing more than literary and historical criticism in distinction from textual criticism, which is technically called lower criticism. Higher criticism must be made use of in the study of any ancient work, and no one thinks of objecting to literary and historical criticism as applied to Homer, or the Veda, or the Koran, or Thucydides, or Livy, or Dante, or Shakespeare. In each case we must first study the text in order to obtain a correct reproduction of that which was written, and then we must study what was written as literature, in relation to the history of the times in which it was written, the history of thought, the history of the nation, and the history of the individual. We must determine whether the person whose name has been connected with it actually wrote it, how he wrote it, for what purpose he wrote it, etc. We must determine whether it has been modified at a later time, and, if so, how and for what reason. All these, and all questions of this sort, belong to the realm of what is known as Higher Criticism. If we believe in the humanity of all of God's revelation to man, we shall, of course, believe in the humanity of the Scriptures, and consequently must apply to the study of those Scriptures human methods. Without the application of these human methods it is impossible to get at the divine, because the divine is inclosed in a human body. This is an application of the doctrine of the Incarnation in the perfect Word of God, Jesus the Christ, to the imperfect word, the Bible, and I think it must be admitted that it is an absolutely necessary sequence of the doctrine of the Incarnation.

Now in dealing with scriptures among all nations and in all

religions, we find that there has been the same tendency to attempt to magnify the divine by removing it absolutely out of the sphere of the human which there has been, as I have already pointed out, in dealing with the thought of the divine in every other relation. This is truer in regard to the scriptures of some of the Ethnic religions than in the case of the Christian Scriptures. As a consequence of these tendencies the Brahmins came ultimately to regard the Veda as self-created. In proportion as, owing to the lapse of time and change of language, thought, and customs, the language of the Veda became unintelligible, in that proportion was the Veda theoretically exalted and glorified. A religion developed which had absolutely nothing to do with the Veda, except that it was remotely descended from it, and the adherents of this religion professed themselves followers of the book of the religion which it had superseded ; and not only followers of it, but worshippers also, regarding the book itself as a manifestation of God, or as God, self-created and self-creative. This was rendered possible by the method of interpretation which was applied to the Veda, by which the Veda itself was completely explained away, and the explanation put in place of the original. Of course, at first the explanation was not too remote from the original sense, but as explanation was put upon explanation, and the explanations became in their turn the subject of explanation and comment, so that men no longer referred to the book itself, surrounding it with a halo of glory and treating it as divine, according to their conception of divine, the condition was reached of which I have spoken, where no one read the Veda or knew anything about the Veda, although professedly accepting it as a revelation of Divinity. A similar course was pursued with regard to the Zoroastrian and Moslem scriptures. It is a common thing to find Moslems who have been educated to read the words of the Koran, and who learn whole chapters to recite for ritual purposes, without knowing the meaning of a single sentence. They have learned it by rote : the language is different from their language ; they have never learned that language, and

consequently they do not know the meaning of what they read or recite. The mere recitation of those sacred words possesses a power for good ; there is a divinity inherent in the outward form of the Koran, the touch of which can strengthen their souls. For the doctrines of their religion they depend upon the explanations of the theologians. And here explanation has been heaped upon explanation, until the original sense is buried out of sight. This is the same thing which the Jews also did with their Scriptures, and our Lord rebuked them for their quibbling explanations, by which the sense and spirit of the original had been lost. Rabbinical and scribal interpretation is a byword to us at the present day, and when by chance we pick up and read passages from the Talmud, what impresses us most of all is the absurd remoteness of those interpretations from the sense of the passages which they pretend to interpret. The Jews proceeded on the theory that all knowledge was revealed in the Bible. To him who understood the interpretation, geography, astronomy, and ethnology were taught in the sacred text. Permit me to cite a sober instance of this method of interpretation pursued by a noted Jewish interpreter of the best post-Talmudic period, viz. Rashi. Commenting upon the first chapter of Genesis, he notes that mention is twice made of fowl. In the twentieth verse it is said, "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." And again, in the twenty-second verse, it is said, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth." Therefore God said both to the waters and to the earth to bring forth fowl. Why has He said to both the water and the earth that they should bring forth fowl, while He said to the waters only to bring forth fish, and to the earth only to bring forth the beasts of the earth ? Why has He said to both earth and water, "Bring forth fowl"? Because the fowl is made out of mud. It is earth and water mixed from which the fowl is brought forth, but the fishes from the water only, and quadrupeds from dry earth. This was understood by men of

the Middle Ages as scientific and even rationalistic interpretation of the Bible.

The Christians were from the outset deeply affected in their interpretation of the Bible, especially, of course, of the Old Testament, by Jewish interpretation. Indeed, you may say that they were dependent upon the Jews for their system of interpretation, and in the case of the Old Testament, for the most part, for the details of that interpretation also. There were very few Christian fathers who really knew anything whatever about the Old Testament. St. Augustine founded mountains of theology on texts of the Old Testament, of whose meaning he had no proper conception. He was one of those who objected not merely to the higher criticism, but even to the lower or textual criticism of the Bible. He was shocked at the efforts of St. Jerome to obtain a correct Latin translation of the Old Testament Scriptures. He had taken the current and corrupt Latin translation, which we know as the Itala, and based his theological propositions upon interpretations of that corrupt text. The substitution of a correct text seemed to him likely to shake the whole system of theology. In reality, there was too much common sense and pure godliness in much of what St. Augustine had formulated to cause the removal of his textual substructure to precipitate a downfall. He really had not founded his theology on those scripture texts which he quoted, but on philosophical speculation, and his scriptural texts were, so to speak, an accident. He had made the Scriptures through those texts say what he conceived they ought to say.

In exact proportion as the Church allowed the Bible to fall into disuse did it profess to exalt it by regarding it as infallible and inerrant. I do not mean that there was any formal statement of the Church to this effect, any doctrinal declaration by the Church as such by which we are bound, but I mean that the current thought of the Church and of its theologians was in this direction. The Reformation was a recall to the Bible as against the theological interpretations and doctrines which, professing to start originally from texts

of the Bible, had come at last to be directly contradictory of those texts, so that the Church authorities were unwilling that the Bible should be put into the hands of those who would interpret it on principles of common sense, and not according to the system of the schools, with their curious combinations of rabbinical methods, Greek philosophy, and scholasticism. It would be amusing, did space permit, to trace the steps by which the Reformers, in their efforts to exalt the Bible, as over against Church authority and Church tradition, removed it from the sphere of men, and surrounded it once more with a new nebula of fanciful interpretation. Men like to put their Bible in the heavens, like the sun, but when they have done so they are too apt to light the furnace of their petty thinkings and make the air so dense with the smoke of their theological speculations, like the fogs of London, that the sun ceases to be visible.

You will observe, by the way, that, precisely as in St. Augustine's day, it is to-day the men who are not students of the Bible itself, who are not familiar with the languages in which it is written, that object most to the new methods of interpretation. The most conservative of Bible students, in the technical sense of the term, is generally radical in comparison with the scholastic theologians who tell him out of the dark and mysterious pages of the Middle Ages, or out of the dry and repellent theology of the Protestant Reformers of a later period, what the Bible ought to mean.

The proper method of dealing with the Scriptures is to apply in their study the same critical methods which one would apply in the study of other books. The humanity that is in them requires the application of human methods, and without those human methods it is impossible to obtain from the Scriptures their real sense. It is fair to say also that the objection to the application of those methods comes from lack of faith. He who has absolute and complete faith in God, and in His revelation to man through man, is not afraid to have every possible light of human wisdom turned upon the Holy Scriptures, believing

that the more their humanity is understood and appreciated the better we shall perceive the divine which is incarnate in that humanity.

I have already said that it is precisely those who are not technical students of the Bible who are most distressed at the application of such methods in Bible study and the results which the critics obtain. This is entirely natural. The man who is not thoroughly familiar with a subject in all its bearings is afraid of any change, because he is apt to confuse the temporary and the permanent, the accidental and the necessary, and, not being certain which is which, is afraid when anything is touched lest the whole may be destroyed. The skilful sculptor does not hesitate to cut deep into the marble with his chisel, because he knows precisely what parts of the marble may be removed and what not. He who is not a sculptor is afraid of the use of the chisel, for he fears that if anything is cut away all may be destroyed. My own experience in dealing with the Bible has been this: I did not thoroughly appreciate the divinity of the Scriptures, and I did not appreciate the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, until I learned to appreciate the humanity of both. I always believed in the divinity of both, but my belief became a new thing when I began to study both from the human side. When I was able to picture our Lord Himself thoroughly and completely as a Man, living as a Man in Judea and Galilee, when I understood His surroundings as a Man, and viewed Him as a Man, hungering and thirsting, tempted and tried, with real human passions and pains, then I learned to know Him as God as I had never done before. God had come down out of Heaven in very deed, and stood close to me and gave all life a new meaning. In the same way, when I learned to read the books of the Bible as I read other books, when I criticised, analysed, questioned as to authorship, assigned parts of books to different influences; when I learned to know the writer through his style, as I learned to know English writers through their style, then the Bible had a

new meaning for me, a new force, and, above all, a divinity which it had never had before. From my own individual experience I argue naturally to the general experience. I believe that this method of study, and this only, will bring out fully the Divinity of our Lord and the divinity of the Scriptures; not a divinity so far removed from man that its magnitude is diminished to a point, like the stars, but a divinity so close that it can be felt, and that its rays warm, cheer, and cherish like the sun.

It is, of course, possible to press the study of the humanity so far or in such a manner that the divinity is completely lost sight of. Scientists in studying Nature sometimes do the same thing; but I do not think that anyone on that account will object to the scientific study of Nature. I suppose we should all agree that, although individuals have in the study of Nature lost sight of God and become unbelievers, nevertheless, for the Church and the world at large the increased knowledge of Nature has meant also an increased knowledge of God. You would not propose to remedy the evils of unbelief resulting from the study of Nature by forbidding that study, or by denying that there is such a thing as a physical universe. No more is it practicable to remedy the evils which result from the correct method of studying the Scriptures by forbidding that study, or denying the humanity that is in those Scriptures.

Some uneasiness has been felt because of the idea, most assiduously promulgated by that extreme class of immovables who always seek to arrogate to themselves the title of orthodox, that this method of study involves the denial of the virgin birth of our Lord, and, consequently, of the Incarnation. Now, what I have been endeavouring to show is that the whole trend of this line of thought is to affirm the Incarnation with especial emphasis, as over against the tendency which has prevailed to belittle or minimise the Incarnation in the endeavour to exalt the Divinity. There may, and probably will be, excesses on the part of individuals; and in opposition to that school which has denied the human birth of our Lord by exalting the Virgin

out of humanity into divinity, there may be an inclination to lay improper stress on the naturalness of our Lord's life. The answer to this error of excess on one side is not to be found in the error of excess on the other. It does not lie in the deification of the Virgin, nor in magnifying the miraculous side of our Lord to an extent which turns the miracles into meaningless magic ; nor in the exaltation of the Scriptures as the inerrant Word of God, infallible and inhuman in every part. It is precisely these positions which have driven men to excess on the other side, which have made them unbelievers, or Unitarians. It may be laid down as a general truth that every heresy is caused by heterodox doctrines of an opposite character within the Church ; and that heresy can be conquered only by recognising the truth at which it aims, and expressing it in a reasonable and orthodox manner. The Church itself has asserted in its Creed that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. The purpose of this article of the Creed is to assert in the clearest and most unmistakable language that He is perfect God and perfect Man. Any belittling of the Humanity with the idea of exalting the Divinity must result ultimately in belittling the Divinity. To belittle the Humanity is as much of a heresy as to belittle the Divinity, and this heresy must result in producing heretical sects, which, in their endeavours to assert what they see has been forgotten, will distort and exaggerate that one thing, and make it the whole of their creed, to the exclusion of all other truth. Belittle the Humanity of our Lord by trying to take the Virgin Mary out of the common rank of woman, and the result will be, as it has been, polytheism, such as is practised in some parts of the Christian Church to-day, where the worship of Christ the Saviour of mankind is nominal ; because, having dehumanised Him, it became necessary to put in His place more human divinities whom man can approach in the ordinary needs of life. Belittle the Divinity of our Lord by asserting that the Scriptures which were written through men are complete, infallible, the Word of God, and you have practically denied the unique Divinity of our Lord

and the necessity of the Incarnation ; and this in the effort to magnify the divine by minimising the human.

When we are told in the first chapter of Genesis that the Spirit of God brooded over the face of chaos, we have the prophecy of the virgin birth. The virgin universe conceived through the Spirit of God Almighty, and the Old Testament is the story of the pre-natal growth, if I may so speak, of the Divine Child, which, in the fulness of time, is to be born in the form of Jesus Christ, of the Virgin Mary by the Holy Ghost.

Below the statement that Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary lies a depth of truth which is altogether lost if the mind is allowed to dwell exclusively on the external side of that statement, and to imagine that that is all that it covers. Rather, it is a statement of the whole plan of God's dealing with man, of the perfect union of divinity and humanity which is to be found in the whole course of His dealing with the world from the creation onward.

CHAPTER IV

OUR LORD'S TREATMENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

PERHAPS the easiest way to obtain a correct view of our Lord's treatment of the Old Testament is to take up the Gospel of St. Matthew, and, following it from beginning to end, to note those passages in which reference is made by our Lord to the Old Testament, comparing them with parallel passages in other Gospels, so far as such parallels exist. It is true that this will not cover every single use of the Old Testament made, nor will it present to us Christ's use in a systematic manner; but it will, I think, give us a good and sufficiently complete picture for the purposes of argument from His use to the proper use to be made by ourselves.

The story of the Temptations, contained both in Matthew iv. and Luke iv., may be regarded as a summary of Christ's attitude toward earlier views of divine revelation, held both by the Jews and also by other peoples. In Exodus xix. we have a description of the theophany at Sinai. The mountain is to be guarded with bounds round about, because "whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death." The presence of God upon the mount is indicated by "thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud," and the mount was "altogether on smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire, and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly." And the Lord bids Moses to "go down and charge the people, lest they break through unto the Lord to gaze, and many of them perish. And let

the priests also, who come near to the Lord, sanctify themselves, lest the Lord break forth upon them."

At the time of our Lord this was commonly regarded among Jewish theologians as the highest revelation of Himself by God to man. To be sure, we have in the Prophets indications of a higher and better conception, as when in the story of Elijah we are told that the Lord is not in the earthquake, nor in the fire, nor in the thunder, but in the still small voice; or, as in Jeremiah, when we are told that it is not on tables of stone, but on the fleshly tablets of the heart that God really writes His highest law. Nevertheless, among Jewish theologians of our Lord's time, the manifestation on Sinai was considered to be a typical and the highest revelation of God's nature made to man. Now the general conception of a divine revelation which we find here was not peculiar to the Jews. It is the view of the way in which God must manifest Himself to man common in its general features to many religions, and you can parallel the essential features of this theophany out of the theology or mythology of many nations. This being regarded as the highest method of the manifestation of God to man, the expectation of the manner of the coming of the Messiah was naturally based among Jewish theologians upon this general conception of the method of manifestation of Divinity, rather than upon those really higher views of Divine manifestation referred to above, which are represented in many prophetical passages, and especially in Isaiah liii.

In His attitude toward the Temptations our Lord expressly and flatly contradicts this conception of the Jewish theologians based upon Exodus xix. and similar passages. The devil that comes to Him in the theology of the Jews would bid Him cast Himself from the pinnacle of the temple and descend upborne by angels. That theology demands of Him the same general method of manifestation which is narrated in Exodus xix. To this He opposed the conception of the Son of Man, of God in man. He will not turn the stones to bread, He will not cast Himself down from the pinnacle of

the temple, He will not seek to make Himself king of the nations of the earth, the most powerful ruler of His time, as David had been. The highest manifestation of God to man is, according to our Lord, the manifestation of Himself in man. It must be thoroughly human, and the Divine must be exhibited, not in clouds and thunder and outward manifestations of might and terror, but in the perfection in man of the divine attributes of love and truth. The Temptations are a mystical setting forth of our Lord's position in this matter, and of the conflict between that position and the conceptions of Jewish theologians. It may be said that in a broad way, not merely our Lord's attitude as described in the Temptations, but His attitude as a whole as described in the four Gospels, contradicts the conception of the highest manifestation of the Divine contained in Exodus xix. God in nature is what Exodus xix. sets forth ; God in man is what our Lord in the New Testament sets forth. Not that God does not cause the portents of nature, but He is not in those in the sense in which He is in the still small voice, speaking within the hearts of men. Comparatively speaking, the theophany at Sinai is a low conception of God. The presence of God is to be sought not in the lightning and the thunder-storm, where the Hebrews in common with other peoples had sought for it, but in the perfection of the moral attributes in God's highest creation—man.

To turn from the general to the more particular. We find in the story of the Temptations our Lord answering the tempter by quotations from the Old Testament, introduced by the words, "It is written." I wish to call attention to the fact that this is a phrase which may be used not only of the Old Testament, but practically of any writing, and that the attitude of the Jewish mind towards the Old Testament as an ancient written document was in part at least the same as that existing everywhere among ancient peoples regarding written documents, and which you will find at the present time among most Orientals. For instance, if in speaking to an ordinary Oriental of the Turkish Empire with reference

to any fact, I am able to take any book in his own language, or in Arabic if he is a Moslem—it really matters very little what—and show him that what I have stated is written in this book, it will have upon his mind almost the effect of proof. So St. Paul, wishing to confirm what he says to the Athenians, is reported as quoting from a Stoic poet (Acts xvii. 28, “As certain also of your own poets have said”), as though it were Scripture, because that for which he could refer to a written document had a double force to the minds of his hearers, or in fact was regarded by most of them as proved if documentary evidence could be cited for it. In the same way, in the Epistle of St. Jude (v. 14), we find the quotation from the apocryphal book of Enoch, in the words, “And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of this,” etc. One of our Lord’s expressions as quoted in the Gospels is, “It is said or written by the ancients.”

This general attitude of the mind towards written documents must be carefully borne in mind in studying the quotations from the Old Testament in the New. In regard to our Lord’s own quotations I really do not need to enter this caveat; but in the consideration of the use which St. Matthew and other New Testament writers make of the Old Testament it should be very carefully borne in mind.

The next passage to which I wish to call attention is the Sermon on the Mount. In Matthew v. 17 our Lord is represented as saying, “Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.” And in verse 18 it is added, “For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.” This is frequently quoted as an assertion of what is ordinarily known as literal, or verbal, inspiration; as though every jot and tittle of the words of the Law were sacred and eternal. But our Lord’s treatment of the Pentateuch in His expositions of the Law, as recorded in that same document of discourses which we know as the Sermon on the Mount, should show the most casual reader that, so far from maintaining any such

literal inspiration, our Lord unhesitatingly condemns and abolishes those portions of the Law and of the Old Testament as a whole which contradict what we now know as the moral law, the law of love. His exposition of the sixth and seventh commandments shows that the jots and tittles of the law to which He refers are of a moral, not a formal nature. The law must be obeyed in the extremest minutiae of its moral application ; but the moral law, and that only, is sacred and eternal. Whatever was written by Moses or by those of olden times which is not consistent with that moral law is to be condemned and rejected.

So in Matthew v. 31 He quotes from Deuteronomy xxiv. 1 the words (which are also contained in substance in Jer. iii. 1), "Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement," and affirms unhesitatingly that this is not the word of God, but in contradiction to that word : "But I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery." That is, such divorce is a breach, or involves a breach, of the seventh commandment when interpreted according to its spirit and not merely its letter. There is no question as to our Lord's position in this matter, for not only is the passage contained in the Gospel according to St. Matthew ; it appears also in the other two synoptic gospels, and is again taken up more at length in Matthew xix., where our Lord, going further still, lays down monogamy as the law of God, deducing it spiritually from the story of the creation, and asserting it as a part of the Divine plan, and thereby tacitly passing a condemnation on Law and Prophets, saints and seers of the past. They did not have the word of God in this matter ; they were in error. This is expressed in His statement that the commandment of Deuteronomy in the matter of divorce was given because of the hardness of their hearts ; that is to say, that man's knowledge of God's will depends upon the condition of his own heart. If the heart of man is hard—that is, ignorant, wilful, dark, barbarous—his conception of God must be accordingly. What He is reported as saying in

Matthew xix. 8, "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives," when transferred into our phraseology means nothing more nor less than, "In the times of your barbarity, when your conceptions of God were low and imperfect, the Law, which was leading you up to something higher, was of necessity of itself low and imperfect." Their conception of God was imperfect, and hence their conception of the moral law was imperfect.

As to the use of the name of Moses which we find in that nineteenth chapter—I would say in passing that it is nothing more than a technical designation by which the Pentateuch was known, precisely as the plays, sonnets, etc., of Shakespeare are known to us by the term "Shakespeare." The name was given, it is true, because of the belief, generally held, that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch; but the use of the term by any given individual may be a mere means of identification of a given passage, and does not in itself imply the acceptance by that individual of such authorship, any more than the use of "Samuel" as the designation of the books of Samuel means that Samuel was their author. If I wish to quote from Shakespeare, I quote, "Shakespeare says," without anyone's supposing that I commit myself to the theory of Shakesperian authorship for that particular place or passage. The matter of authorship is not in mind. The object in view is identification of the passage quoted. If the line of argument which treats the use of Moses in such passages as an assertion on our Lord's part of the Mosaic authorship were to be accepted, then logically in Matthew v. 33, where our Lord quotes one of the commandments of the Decalogue, with the introduction, "It was said by them of old time," it is fair to argue that He did not believe that this was by Moses.

Continuing our Lord's exposition of the Law as recorded in Matthew v. and following chapters, we find in chapter v. 38, 39, these words: "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, That ye resist not him that is evil," etc. The same passage

appears in Luke vi. 29. Here, again, so far from preserving the jots and tittles of the Law in the verbal sense, our Lord reverses and repudiates the Law. It is worth while to observe that what is true of the manner of the theophany at Sinai is also true of the *lex talionis*. It is in no sense peculiar to the Hebrews. We find the same law in actual practice among all ancient nations, and in written form it occurs in all the early systems of law; such as the Laws of the Ten Tables, the Laws of Solon, the Laws of Lycurgus, the Law of Manu, etc. In the Old Testament it appears in every stratum of the legislation: in the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xxi. 24); in Deuteronomy (xix. 21); and in Leviticus (xxiv. 20).

In Matthew v. 43 we find a further similar passage. Our Lord says: "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies," etc. Here the words, "Ye have heard that it was said," do not introduce the quotation of any individual passage of the Old Testament. Our Lord is contradicting the general spirit of many passages and the inferences that had been drawn from them; and also reflecting on certain acts of Israel and its leaders which are recorded without apparent condemnation in the Old Testament. In Deuteronomy xxiii. 6 the commandment with regard to the Ammonite and the Moabite is, "Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever"; and Psalms lxix., cix., etc., contain imprecations in the spirit of that verse of Deuteronomy. All such parts of the Old Testament are rejected by our Lord as not of God in the sense in which He is of God.

A similar rejection of the Old Testament Law by our Lord is found in Matthew xv. 11 ff., a passage which occurs also in Mark vii. 15-19. The Pharisees and scribes have complained because our Lord's disciples do not follow the school rules in regard to clean and unclean, failing to wash their hands before they eat. Our Lord, starting from this as a basis, goes on to lay down the spiritual law of clean and unclean, and in doing so demolishes completely not only the structure that the scribes had built upon the Old Testament, but also the Old

Testament law of clean and unclean. The apostles are very much astonished, and cannot believe that He means what He says in a literal sense, so that "Peter answered and said unto Him, Declare unto us this parable."

Indeed, even after our Lord's Ascension His meaning was not grasped for many years. St. Peter was the first to realise His meaning in the vision at Joppa, but even then his Jewish prejudices were too strong for him to put the teaching into practice with any degree of consistency. Nevertheless, our Lord's statement, as quoted both by St. Matthew and St. Mark, is sufficiently explicit: "Not that which entereth into the mouth defileth a man, but that which proceedeth out of the mouth." Deuteronomy xiv. and Leviticus xi. both go by the board. The peculiar holiness of Daniel for not eating the food of the Chaldeans (Dan. i.) ceases to exist. In point of fact, the notion of clean and unclean, as contained in Deuteronomy xiv. and Leviticus xi. and glorified in Daniel i., was common to the Hebrews with the nations about them. Every one of these had its law of clean and unclean, and every nation ascribed these laws of clean and unclean to its god. Our Lord seizes on the spirit of the law behind the letter. There is a clean and unclean; but such laws as these that have been promulgated in the name of My Father, "Thou shalt not eat oysters, or swine's flesh, or camels, or the like, because they are unclean," are not the law of My Father which is in heaven; "For not that which entereth into the mouth defileth a man, but that which proceedeth out of the mouth, this defileth a man." Not one jot or one tittle of the Law of God shall, or can, pass away, but the notions of the Jews, as much as those of the Greeks and Arabs and Syrians and Babylonians, were all alike overturned by Him Who came to reveal the perfect will of a spiritual God. Compare with this treatment of divorce, *lex talionis*, clean and unclean, etc., our Lord's treatment of the question of place of worship, in the conversation with the woman of Samaria, as recorded in John iv. He refutes and repudiates Law and Prophets alike in His denial of the special sanctity of the Temple

at Jerusalem and in His assertion that "neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father."

Turning back to Matthew xi. 10, we find our Lord quoting as a prophecy of John the Baptist, Malachi iii. 1, and at the same time denying the literal truth of the words of the prophet as contained in iv. 5. Malachi had said, "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come"; and the Jews, holding the Old Testament to be literally and verbally inspired, expected to see Elijah come. Our Lord, in asserting that St. John was Elijah, practically affirmed that the prophets were not inspired literally and verbally, that their inspiration was of a spiritual nature. What Malachi looked for in the way of a preparation for the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord was fulfilled in the work of John the Baptist. No more literal fulfilment of Malachi's words was to be expected. Literally, Malachi's prophecy was untrue; spiritually interpreted, it was true.

Turning to Matthew xii. 38 ff., we come to the famous passage of the sign of Jonah, which is so often claimed as an assertion on our Lord's part of the historical fact of the swallowing and vomiting up alive of Jonah by a great fish, as told in that noble parable of the Book of Jonah. To begin with, the principle on which such a meaning is drawn from our Lord's words is in itself false. I have never found occasion to make any argument from what is known as the *kenosis*. The question of the limitation of our Lord's understanding as a man has never seemed to me to be really involved in any of the critical questions with regard to His use of the Old Testament. He is compelled by the conditions of those to whom He speaks to speak to them in their own language. He cannot speak Greek to Hebrews, nor can He speak in a twentieth-century tongue to people of the first century. He cannot use the language of the Copernican system to those whose whole idea of the universe is based on the Ptolemaic theory; nor can He speak with the tongue of the higher critics to men who have not the slightest conception of the ideas of the higher criticism.

Without touching the question of *kenosis*, we find a limitation outside of Himself in the conditions in which He is labouring. If He wishes to quote the Pentateuch, He must quote it as Moses; if He wishes to speak about the changes of day and night consequent upon the movement of the earth on its axis, He must speak, in order to be understood, of the "rising and setting of the sun"; and if He wishes to draw a moral lesson out of the stories of the Old Testament, He cannot enter into the question of their literal, historical accuracy, but, without opening that question at all, He must refer to them as though they were facts, precisely as everyone else did. No teaching could be derived from our Lord's words in such matters, unless He were to state explicitly, which He does not, that an object of His citation is to affirm the historical character of the fact alluded to. To base an argument as to His belief in a given case solely on the fact that He uses the ordinary language of His time and country is to build upon false principles. But in this particular case a comparative study of the Gospels seems to make it probable that our Lord never uttered the words in question.

In Luke xi. 29 ff. we are told that when the multitude were gathered together, our Lord began to say, "This generation is an evil generation; it seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given it but the sign of Jonah; for even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so also shall the Son of Man be to this generation. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and shall condemn them: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and, behold, a greater than Jonah is here." This passage is perfectly clear. "The sign of Jonah," to which our Lord refers, is not the sign of his being swallowed by a great fish, and vomited up alive after three days, but that in regard to which he was a sign to the Ninevites. According to the

narrative in the Book of Jonah, the Ninevites heard nothing of Jonah's adventures. He came to them to declare against them the judgment of God. They accepted the sign that God was wroth with them for their evil doings, and repented and were saved, heathen though they were. He, Christ, has come to the Jews with a similar message from God. He is a similar sign, but they have rejected Him. That this is the meaning of the passage is shown by the further reference to Solomon and the queen of Sheba. The whole tone of the passage reminds one of the comparison by our Lord of Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida with Sodom and Gomorrah; of unbelieving, self-satisfied Jews with the Gentiles whom they despised.

The passage in St. Matthew's Gospel is not equally clear. There we are told that certain of the scribes and Pharisees answered Him, saying, "Master, we would see a sign from Thee. But He answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonah. (For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so must the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.) The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and, behold, a greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here."

It will be observed that in a slightly different order the Gospel according to St. Matthew has three verses identical with those in St. Luke, namely, the statement that an evil and adulterous generation seeks after a sign, and shall have no sign given it but the sign of the prophet Jonah; the statement that the men of Nineveh shall stand up in judgment, and condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and the statement that the queen of the south shall rise up in judgment with this generation, and condemn it, because she came from

the most distant part of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon.

But there is a fourth verse in the Gospel according to St. Matthew which is not in the Gospel according to St. Luke, and that is the statement, "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Comparing the two passages, and considering what the connexion of thought is, it seems to me quite clear that this verse is an addition of St. Matthew's. A comparison of St. Matthew's reports of our Lord's sayings and doings with the treatment of St. Mark or St. Luke will show that St. Matthew always seeks to find a Bible verse appropriate to the occasion, which he introduces into the narrative. For an instance of this compare the accounts of the parable of the Sower, as given in the two Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke. In Luke viii. 10 we read, "And He said, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God: but to others in parables; that seeing they might not see, and hearing they might not understand"—words in which our Lord clearly quotes the sense of Isaiah vii. 9. With this agrees substantially Mark iv. 11, 12. Turning to Matthew xiii. 13 we read, "Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing hear not; neither do they understand"; and then there is added, in verse 14, these words, "And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which says, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive." Does St. Matthew mean to put these words into the mouth of our Lord? It seems to me that his method of reporting our Lord is this: that where our Lord referred to the Old Testament he seeks to give the quotation, and—which is perfectly proper according to the ancient idea of an historian in recording the words of a speaker—he sometimes puts the passage which he himself has taken from the Old Testament into the mouth of our Lord.

Where he is dealing with the acts of our Lord the Old

Testament verses cannot be put into His mouth, but they are introduced into the narrative with the statement that whatever was done, was done "in order that it might be fulfilled which was written, saying," etc. In Matthew xxi. 2 ff., where our Lord has told the disciples to go into the village over against them, and to take a she-ass which they will find there, He says to them, "If any man say ought unto you, ye shall say, The Lord hath need of them ; and he shall send them. Now this is come to pass that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Tell ye the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." The quotation from Zechariah ix. 9 might be supposed to be put, according to the Revised Version, into our Lord's mouth. When we turn to Mark xi. and to Luke xix., and read the same narrative, we do not find the quotation used at all. The Authorised Version gives the verse in question as from St. Matthew, and not from our Lord—"Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet." There is, in fact, a certain ambiguity in the phraseology of St. Matthew, for he would not feel the necessity for making the distinction which we make between a quotation inserted by himself and one actually used by our Lord.

So, in the passage with regard to the sign of the prophet Jonah, St. Matthew has simply introduced a statement of his own which summarises that which is to all readers, at first sight at least, the most striking thing in the story of Jonah, and this statement is put in the midst of our Lord's words, so that it seems to the modern reader to be put into the mouth of our Lord in the same way as in the other cases to which I have referred. This verse, therefore, as the comparison of passages shows, is not to be taken as the words of our Lord, but as the explanatory comment of St. Matthew, who sees in the story of Jonah a sign of our Lord's Resurrection. Use a modern device, bracket the verse, and the difficulty vanishes at once.

The designation of the sources of our Lord's quotations

from the Old Testament in the different Gospels is an interesting and rather curious study. In Matthew xv. 4 our Lord is quoted as saying, "For God said, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death." The same passage is quoted in Mark vii. 10 in this form: "For Moses said, Honour thy father and thy mother: and, He that speaketh evil of father or mother, let him die the death." The intention is to quote the passage as of divine authority. In the Gospel according to St. Mark it is quoted with the technical designation of "the Law," that is, Moses. In the Gospel according to St. Matthew, it is quoted with reference to the source of inspiration of the Law, namely, God. But what were the words our Lord used? Did He say, "God said," or "Moses said"? I do not suppose we know, and it is a matter of complete indifference. He might with perfect propriety have used either form. There is a similar case in Matthew xxii. 23-33, where, in our Lord's answer to the argument of the Sadducees, Exodus iii. 6 is quoted. St. Matthew represents our Lord as citing it with the introduction, "Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, . . . ?" In the parallel passage in Mark xii. 18 ff. our Lord is represented as saying, "Have ye not read in the book of Moses, in the Bush, how God spake?" and in the same passage in the Gospel according to St. Luke (xx. 27 ff.) our Lord's words are represented to be, "But that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed in the Bush."

The important truth in these cases is the Divine authority of the statement, and those who report the words of our Lord agree substantially in that, although they differ so markedly in the manner in which they introduce the quotations. These passages confirm my previous assertion that we cannot lay any stress on the use of such formulae as "Moses said," etc.

With regard to the difference between St. Matthew and the other Gospels in the matter of Old Testament quotations, I may here refer to Matthew xxiii. 35, "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the

blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar." Now in 2 Chronicles xxiv. 20, 21 we are told that a certain Zacharias son of Jehoiada the priest was stoned with stones at the command of the king, in the court of the house of the Lord. If this is a quotation from Chronicles, it is incorrect, and either he that quoted it or the chronicler is in error. If it refers, as some of the best commentators suppose, not to the event recorded in Chronicles, but to the murder in the midst of the Temple, by two of the most daring of the zealots during the Jewish war, of "Zachariah son of Baruch," recorded by Josephus (*Bell.* iv. 6, 4), then it occurred a generation after our Lord's time. Did our Lord use these words? It is noteworthy that this whole twenty-third chapter, the chapter of the denunciations, is wanting in St. Mark and St. Luke. It looks as though, in the same way that St. Matthew gathered a great amount of similar material together in the Sermon on the Mount, so he had gathered together here all the scattered words of denunciation spoken at one time or another, and edited them after his manner as one discourse, with such references to the Old Testament (and possibly even to recent contemporary history) as he could make. Such passages as this thirty-fifth verse, I should suppose, are not to be taken as words of our Lord, but are due rather to St. Matthew's manner of supporting what he reports of our Lord's words by Old Testament citations and the like, which he weaves in as though they were part of the discourse.

In Matthew xxiv. 15 we read, "When therefore ye see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place (whoso readeth, let him understand)," etc. In the same chapter (*v.* 36 f.) we are told that no one knows of the day of the second coming, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only; and as were the days of Noah, so shall be the coming of the Son of Man. In Mark xiii. 14, the parallel passage, we do not find any formal citation of the prophet Daniel, although we find the reference to the abomination of desolation, and the

whole of the reference to the days of Noah is omitted. In St. Luke's account of the same (xxi.) we find neither the reference to Daniel nor the reference to Noah. The argument would seem to be that the quotation of Daniel and the citation of the story of Noah are part of St. Matthew's regular method of reinforcing or explaining our Lord's words by references connecting them with the Old Testament.

In Matthew xix. 16-22 we find the story of the man who came to ask the Master what good thing he should do to have eternal life. Our Lord quotes to him the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and fifth commandments from the Decalogue, following this with a citation and application of Leviticus xix. 18, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," which citation is put along with the commandments of the Decalogue, as though it were itself one of them. The parallel passages, in the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Luke, omit the citation from Leviticus xix. 18. (St. Luke differs from the other Gospels in quoting the commandments after the order of the Septuagint, instead of the Hebrew order, that is, placing the seventh commandment before the sixth.) Now Leviticus xix. 18 is a favourite passage with our Lord, and it seems probable that in this case St. Matthew has introduced, along with the commandments which our Lord quotes, that summary of those commandments which our Lord used on other occasions.

In Matthew xxii. 36-40 one of the Pharisees asks our Lord, "Master, which is the great commandment in the Law?" and our Lord is quoted as answering him by a citation, not from the Decalogue, but from Deuteronomy vi. 5, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," etc, and Leviticus xix. 18, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." He turns to the spirit behind the Decalogue, not to the Decalogue. In the parallel passage in the Gospel according to St. Mark Deuteronomy vi. 4, "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord," is quoted, as well as Deuteronomy vi. 5; and this is one of the few passages where there is more of the Old Testament put into our Lord's mouth in the Gospel of

St. Mark than in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. Strictly speaking, there is no parallel passage in the Gospel according to St. Luke, but in Luke x. 25 we find on another occasion a certain lawyer represented as tempting our Lord, saying, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" whereupon our Lord quotes Deuteronomy vi. 5 and Leviticus xix. 18, just as He is represented as doing upon this occasion in St. Matthew and St. Mark.

It is worthy of note that our Lord, in His quotation of Leviticus xix. 18, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," gives a very different sense to those words from that which they have in the connexion in which they appear in the Book of Leviticus. The commandment there concerns the Israelite only; that is, the neighbour referred to is the Israelite. It is part of a series which directs a different treatment of the Israelite from that of the foreigner. Our Lord takes the spirit of these commandments and expands their force by changing the conception of God's relations to man, and hence of man's relations to his fellow-men. What in the school of the Law they learned to do and to feel toward their Israelitish brothers they are now ordered to do and to feel toward all men, because all men are brothers, children of one Father which is in Heaven. It is a spiritual, not a literal interpretation of the Law. Indeed, it rejects and repudiates the letter.

I have noticed the method in which St. Matthew uses the Old Testament and his efforts to connect everything with the Old Testament. It may be remarked in passing that this is more noticeable where he is recording the events of our Lord's life than where he is recording His words, and in the introductory chapters of his Gospel we are almost amazed at the method of treating the Old Testament which we find. He endeavours to connect everything in our Lord's life in one way or another with some particular passage in the Old Testament; accordingly a passage must be found which shall connect our Lord in some way with the town of Nazareth. Now in Isaiah xi. 1 we read, "And there cometh forth a shoot from the stock of Jesse, and a Branch (*nezer*) from his roots

beareth fruit." Here the Messiah is called a *nezer* (branch), therefore, St. Matthew says, it was prophesied that "He shall be a Nazarene." It must be understood that there is absolutely no connexion between *nezer*, meaning branch, and the word Nazarene. The similarity in outward form is a pure accident.

I might call attention at this point to the tendency which showed itself very early in the handling of the Scriptures to introduce modifications or explanations into the text on the part of those who transcribed it. So, in Matthew v. 22, the received text reads, "But I say unto you that whosoever shall be angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment." The correct text has no "without a cause," but simply says, "Whosoever is angry with his brother is in danger of the judgment." The person who wrote in the words "without a cause" did not appreciate the whole meaning of our Lord's words. But evidently the body of the Church was in sympathy with him in feeling the need of a modification of our Lord's very radical statement, and consequently his correction, or marginal note, crept into the text in ordinary use. A better-known example of text corruption is 1 John v. 7, where the doctrine of the Trinity is asserted in the famous passage of the three that bear record in heaven. Another instance is the doxology to the Lord's Prayer, which appears in the received text in St. Matthew's version of the prayer. It is now traced back, I believe, to the North of Africa. It was a doxology added to the prayer in liturgical use, and from that it crept into the text.

A consideration of the methods of early writers in the handling of the text should make us extremely cautious in regard to the treatment of mere words in the Bible, as though the form in which they have come down to us were literally accurate. The whole literary conception of the writers and transcribers of Bible texts was very different from our own—so different that we cannot seek from Bible writers verbal accuracy of the sort which we demand at the present day, as I think is brought out very fully the instant we compare one gospel narrative with another.

In one case a quotation from the Gospel according to St. Mark differs from a quotation in St. Matthew and St. Luke in such a manner as to suggest a bias on the part of St. Mark. Matthew (xxi. 13) and Luke (xix. 46), in narrating our Lord's purification of the Temple, when He drove out them that bought and sold therein, report Him as quoting from Isaiah lvi. 7 the words, "Mine house shall be called an house of prayer." St. Mark (xi. 17) gives the quotation in a fuller form, "house of prayer for all peoples." I am inclined to suppose the quotation as reported by St. Matthew and St. Luke more likely to have been that used by our Lord, and that St. Mark, knowing of the additional words which belonged to the passage in the original, and being interested in precisely that aspect of the gospel which made it a gospel for all peoples, gave the quotation in this fuller form as spoken by our Lord.

In Matthew xxi. 42, Psalm cxviii. 22, 23 is quoted under the designation "scriptures": "Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures," etc. St. Mark (xii. 10) quotes the same passage under the same title; but St. Luke (xx. 17) quotes verse 22 only, with the preface, "What then is this that is written?" It is a written thing, a thing that is handed down in writing; that is the thought which lies in the designation "scripture," to an extent which we do not always recognise. "It is written"—anything that was written in times long gone by has a value and a sanction which sets it aside from the things of to-day.

I have already referred to our Lord's quotation of Exodus iii. 6 and the discussion with the Sadducees concerning the resurrection of the dead, reported in Matthew xxii., Mark xii., and Luke xx. It will be observed that in the discussions reported in these chapters our Lord meets, one after the other, different opponents, accepts their own basis of argument, applies their own method, and defeats them. Our Lord's object here is the same as that in the discussion with the Pharisees, recorded in the same chapter (Matt. xxii. 41-46). In the latter place He undertakes to show the Pharisees, according to their own methods, from what they accept, that their view of the Messiah

is incorrect. Here He treats the Sadducees in the same way. In neither place, surely, can our Lord be understood as saying that this is the proper interpretation of the Old Testament. What He does say is, "You accept this, now observe the logical results; your position is untenable on your own showing."

When He quotes, "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," to the Sadducees as an argument to them that God is a God of the living, not of the dead, and that therefore the dead rise again; or when He quotes Psalm cx. as an argument to the Pharisees that because David in the spirit called the Messiah Lord, therefore the Messiah could not be inferior to David, He is presenting to each class an *argumentum ad hominem*. It is not the sort of reasoning which He adopts in general, and on which He relies to establish the truth of His mission and to convince men of His Divinity. Every passage must be interpreted in connexion with its surroundings, and all words in connexion with their use. It might be added, with regard to the quotation from Psalm cx. 1, that whereas the Psalm, as a whole, is of very late date, and could not possibly be ascribed to David, or the period of David, it is not impossible that the first two verses are of earlier origin. There is even a bare possibility that they belonged to some old poem going back as far as the days of David. I am not prepared to assert, therefore, that it is absolutely impossible that these words might have been, in substantially their present form, composed by David himself, although it is extremely improbable. As far as our Lord's utterances are concerned, however, I consider it a matter of complete indifference whether they were composed by David or Simon Maccabæus. Our Lord is simply quoting them as what the Pharisees themselves would say. If we were to translate it into our idiom, we should introduce it by some passage such as, "You say so and so, and, on the basis of your argument, so and so follows." But that is not the method of the gospel writers, and I can give an admirable example of misinterpretation of a very important text for the simple reason that people have expected the

gospellers to write after the manner and method of our own period, and have misinterpreted them because they did not do so. Thus in Matthew v. 21 ff., in our Lord's interpretation of the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," He says, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. But I say unto you, That every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: and whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire." Now commentators generally have attributed to our Lord as His own the words, "and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council," which destroys the force of the passage in very large part. The meaning is really this: "It was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever did kill was in danger of being tried and condemned by the courts appointed to execute the law. I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother is in danger of the judgment of God. You have made an application of that commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill,' to the use of libellous and abusive terms, and according to your legal code, whosoever calls his brother by the term 'Raca,' is in danger of punishment by the Sanhedrim; but I say unto you, That whosoever shall call his brother any name of opprobrium—the most general possible—is in danger of the hell of fire." The introductory phrase, which our methods of editing would require, is not introduced, and therefore the literal interpreter is apt to make up, as he has done, a new commandment, issued by our Lord, that nobody must call any other person Raca.

To sum up briefly the results of this investigation: I should say that our Lord regarded the Old Testament as scripture, and as containing a divine revelation to man through man, but He does not treat that revelation as complete and perfect, nor does He treat the individual men through whom the revelation has come as infallible. The revelation of the Old Testament is incomplete and imperfect, and consequently

there are things in the Old Testament which are untrue, and teaching which is contrary to the absolute divine truth. Our Lord taught that the whole of the Old Testament prophesies of Him, and was preparing the way for Him, but He does not anywhere teach that individual prophets prophesied of the details of His life, or that their words are to be taken literally as utterances concerning facts in His life. He accepts the Old Testament spiritually and not literally. In the Law He accepts as divine that which also commends itself to our consciences as in itself true. The proof of the truth of any given passage is not its authorship nor its external claim to be the word of God, but itself. There is a moral law, of which He is the highest revelation, and we, enlightened by that revelation and guided by the Spirit, are quite capable of judging of the truth of any passage in the Old Testament. We are to do what He did. He judged of the truth of Scripture by the final moral law, and in doing so taught us to do the same thing. We are to accept or reject it according to its truth, and the truth is to be determined by the law of God as revealed in the character and teaching of Jesus Christ.

With regard to prophetic utterances, He has pointed out the same general method. The prophets prophesied of Him, but it does not follow that when a writer said, "He shall make His grave with the rich in His death," if he ever did say it, he is prophesying of the circumstance of our Lord's burial in the tomb of the rich Joseph of Arimathea. The inspiration of the prophets is of a moral character, just as is the inspiration of the Law, and their power of predicting that which is to come is based on the moral character of their mission. They perceive moral features, the necessary victory of right over wrong, the victory of God; they understand better than others the nature of God's dealings with men, and of His methods of revealing Himself. It is with this side of their work that our Lord is naturally concerned. It is the morality of their predictions which He claims as foretelling Him.

The writers of the New Testament are influenced to a greater or less degree by the traditional Jewish treatment of

the Old Testament, and this is particularly true of such writers as the authors of the Gospel according to St. Matthew and of the Epistle to the Hebrews. We have to make allowance for this in considering their use of the Old Testament. The way in which we are to interpret the use which St. Matthew, or the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, makes of the Old Testament is to be determined by comparison with our Lord's use. He is the norm, not they. They are human and fallible; but behind their method lies the reality, which our Lord had Himself declared and accepted, of the inspiration of the Old Testament scriptures.

It is sometimes said, "Will not this method of interpreting the Bible destroy the connexion between the Old Testament and the New, and will it not rob such texts as, 'They pierced His hands and His feet,' or a 'woman shall compass a man,' of their meaning in regard to Christ?" The method of interpreting the Bible which I have here proposed cannot rob any text of its meaning, nor can it destroy the connexion between the Old and the New, nor does it deny the prophecies of the New in the Old. It is nothing but the application of Christ's method, rather than the method of some of the Jewish disciples of Christ. No doubt a great many individual texts, in the way in which they are ordinarily interpreted, must be relegated sooner or later to the attic; but a great many more texts, interpreted in a better and higher way, will take the place of these, and the Old Testament, as a whole, will be more clearly seen to prepare the way for Christ, and to proclaim His coming, His nature, and His mission. The whole Old Testament will become a prophecy of Christ, rather than single and individual passages; and everything will rest on a moral basis, appealing to the conscience and the reason, rather than on a basis which must seem to any but the very credulous one of chance and caprice.

PART II
EVOLUTION AND THE BIBLE

CHAPTER V

MODERN STUDY OF THE BIBLE

IT is customary in certain quarters to call students of the Bible, according to modern methods, "higher critics," and to designate the present-day methods of Bible study in general "Higher Criticism," which Higher Criticism is supposed to indicate a dangerous laxity regarding the fundamental tenets of Christianity, if not absolute infidelity. How many who thus use the term have any knowledge of its origin and true meaning, or of the history of the development of the present science (for such it may fairly be called) of Bible study? Who to-day would dispute Le Clerc's statement in his criticism (1685) of Simon's *Critical History of the Old Testament*, that in writing the history of a book it is not enough to say "when and by whom it was written, what copyists transcribed it, and what faults they committed in transcribing it. It is not sufficient to tell us who translated it, and to call our attention to defects in his version; nor even to teach us who commented upon it, and what there is that is faulty in those comments. We must discover, if that is possible, with what purpose the author composed it, what occasion caused him to take up his pen, and to what opinions or to what events he may make allusion in that work." And yet this is "Higher Criticism."

It was Eichhorn, of Göttingen, who first, a little more than a hundred years later, applied to the method of Bible study thus defined by the Dutch scholar the term "Higher Criticism," "a new name," as he says, "to no humanist." Hear how he expounds the value of this Higher Criticism

for the interpretation of the Book of Genesis. "The credibility of the book obviously gains by it. The historian is no longer obliged to rely on one reporter in the history of the most distant past; and in the duplicated narratives of the same event he is not obliged to force into harmony the unessential differences in accessory circumstances by artificial devices. He sees in such divergences the marks of independent origin, and finds in their agreement in the main important confirmation. The interpreter, when the Higher Criticism has separated his documents for him, need no longer wrestle with difficulties which are insoluble. He will no longer explain the second chapter of Genesis by the first, or the first by the second, and the world will cease to lay on Moses the burden of the sins of his younger expositors. Finally, when the Higher Criticism has distinguished between the writers, and characterised each of them by his general method, his diction, his favourite expressions, and other peculiarities, her lower sister (textual, or lower criticism), who occupies herself only with words and spies out false readings, lays down her own rules and principles for determining the text, discovering glosses, and detecting interpolations and transpositions."

Devout believer in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch as Eichhorn was, he was as sharply attacked by the traditionalists of his day as the higher critics of the present generation have been by the present-day traditionalists,—which latter, by the way, unknown to themselves, perhaps, stand in general where the "Higher Critic," Eichhorn, stood a hundred and twenty years ago—so that he wrote: "Party spirit will, perhaps, for a couple of decades snort at the Higher Criticism, instead of rewarding it with the thanks which are really due it."

But to trace the history of the modern method of Bible study we must go much further back than the times of Eichhorn or Le Clerc. Higher Criticism may fairly be said to have its beginnings in the translation of the Old Testament out of the Hebrew into Greek. The tendency in the sacred literature of all languages is towards the doctrine of literal

inspiration: that the very language in which the Sacred Book is written is sacred, and that every word and even every letter of the Sacred Script has value and importance. To-day the orthodox Moslem protests against any translation of the Koran, and whatever his own tongue, and however unintelligible to him the original text of the Koran may be, he persists in the repetition of its words in Arabic only. The same is true in an even more extreme degree of the Veda and Avesta. The Jew, likewise, in all lands reads in the synagogue his Sacred Book in the original Hebrew, and old-fashioned rabbins still claim that Hebrew is the sacred language, given by God to man, and spoken in the Garden of Eden, a view which many Christians held not many decades since. As a curiosity of scholarship, I may mention an American rabbi, born in Hungary, who studied Sanscrit and comparative philology with me under the late Professor Whitney, of Yale, a quarter of a century since. His object in so doing was to obtain the material to prove what he firmly believed: that Sanscrit and all other languages were derived from Hebrew, the tongue given of God to men.

I have already, in a former chapter, pointed out the result of the translation of the Old Testament into Hebrew in Alexandria. By the fact of that translation the books of the Old Testament were brought into the arena of Greek scientific investigation. The same methods were applied to them which were applied to the study of Homer, the Greek tragedians, philosophers, etc., what we may fairly call the Higher Criticism of that day. An effort was made to determine the authorship of the various books, and they were rearranged on a new scheme, according to their authors and their contents, and supplied with headings accordingly. In spite of the opposition of the orthodox Jews of Palestine, this translation and rearrangement of the books of the Old Testament became the Bible of the Greek-speaking Jews of Egypt, and from them it was adopted by the Christian Church.

The early Christians did not hold to literal inspiration in

the orthodox Jewish sense. It was not the language, but the sense with which they were concerned. Accordingly the Bible was translated into the language of each Church, so that there have come down to us not one, but several Greek translations, besides the numerous Syriac, Latin, Gothic, Ethiopic, Coptic, Armenian, and Arabic translations of the Scriptures. But as the Dark Ages set in the Christian point of view began to change, and each Church came to consider its own translation of the Bible as a finality, applying to it with curious logical inconsistency that doctrine of literal inspiration, which, as we have seen, has affected the sacred literature of all lands. The Ethiopians changed their language, but the old, unintelligible Ethiopic Scriptures remained untranslated and were regarded as sacred in their letter. The same was true in the Greek Church and the Armenian Church. Throughout the West the Latin translation came to be regarded everywhere as the sacred letter of Scripture. For a time men had ceased to reason. Authority had usurped the place of reason in all departments of knowledge. For centuries the philosophy, mathematics, medicine, astrology, and the like, which the West had borrowed from the Greeks in the days when the Greeks were the scientific and progressive thinkers of the world, were accepted as a finality on the authority of antiquity. They were discussed and commentated; hair-splitting speculations were based upon them, but no effort was made to go behind what had been handed down or to examine the foundations upon which it rested.

A companion doctrine to the doctrine of literal inspiration is the doctrine that all knowledge is contained in sacred scripture, that scripture is not only an instruction in religion, but also a revelation for science, for geography, for history. This doctrine, common to all peoples who have maintained a literal inspiration of their sacred scriptures, was adopted in the Dark Ages by the Christian Church, and it was with this doctrine that the thinkers of the Renaissance first came in conflict.

With the fall of Constantinople and the invention of printing a new era dawned in the West. There was a new birth of literature and of knowledge. Men began to think and to explore for themselves, and authority was compelled to yield place to reason. But it was a slow process. The prejudices of ages, and the organised opposition of a Church and society entrenched in those prejudices, had to be overcome. Astronomers, physicists, geographers, physicians were one after another confronted with the charge of heresy, because they contradicted the views derived from the ancient Greeks, and supposed to be revealed in the Bible. We are all familiar with the religious objections with which Columbus was confronted when he propounded the theory of a Western Hemisphere, and the condemnation and persecution of Copernicus, Galileo, and other great discoverers. Where the bulk of the Chinese stand to-day, there the Church and the great mass of the people of the West stood at the close of the fifteenth and the commencement of the sixteenth centuries. And even to-day the battle is scarcely won. Old men will remember the prejudice with which comparative philology was regarded, as contradicting what was supposed to be the Bible teaching, that Hebrew was the original language, given by God to men ; or the storm raised by the geologists and astronomers who declared that the world must have been created earlier than B.C. 4004 ; and men who have not yet reached middle age have heard from the pulpit or read in religious books and journals denunciations of Darwin and his epoch-making doctrine of Evolution, on the ground that that doctrine contradicted the Bible.

What was achieved in the world of natural science by the discoveries of Columbus, Galileo, Copernicus, and others affected the world of literature also. Men commenced to question the writings of the past, their traditional claims to authorship and to authority. But here progress was even slower than in the field of natural science. It was the famous battle of the books between Bentley and Boyle in the closing year of the seventeenth century which first established modern

literary criticism on a firm foundation. Up to that time it was generally supposed that the questions of authorship, date, and composition of ancient books had been settled by competent scholars of the past, better fitted to decide the question than modern critics, and their authority was supposed to have placed these questions beyond cavil.

The battle of the books was fought over the *Epistles of Phalaris*. Bentley proved that these epistles were not, as had been supposed, written by Phalaris. The main points of his argument were: (1) that there is conclusive internal evidence of later authorship, in the mention of places and things which did not exist at the time of Phalaris; (2) by the argument of language they are shown to have been later than the time of Phalaris, since they employ a dialect not used until after his time; (3) they presuppose different conditions of thought and different customs from those prevailing in the time of Phalaris; (4) the famous argument of silence—that there is no reference anywhere to the *Epistles of Phalaris* for a thousand years after his time.

As a result of this battle of the books, men began to question in all literary fields the authority on which traditions of authorship rested, and to apply everywhere the principles which Bentley had laid down. But this involved much more than the mere question of authorship. It involved, ultimately, historical traditions, as well as the traditions of literary composition; for the two are inevitably linked together, and scholars had accepted the statements of ancient writers with regard to historical facts on the same authority on which they had accepted the traditional authorship of ancient books. But the process of investigation was slow, and men continued to accept the stories of William Tell, Romulus and Remus, and the like on the authority of the past, long after they had refused to accept traditions of literary authorship on similar authority. It was not until the present century that Niebuhr subjected the traditions of Roman history to a searching, critical examination, as epoch-making in its line as Bentley's investigation of the authorship of the *Epistles of Phalaris* had

been in the line of literature. It was Niebuhr's work which led Ewald to his famous reconstruction of Hebrew history, the foundation on which all later work in the study of the history of Israel is founded.

It was inevitable that the awakening of thought and the substitution of reason for authority in science, secular literature, and secular history, should ultimately affect sacred literature and sacred history as well. But these latter investigations have a history of their own. It was the Spanish Jews among whom, chronologically, the work of Old Testament criticism began, even before the time of the Renaissance; for we may pass over altogether the uncritical speculations of the first and following Christian centuries with regard to Ezra's authorship of the Pentateuch and other books of the Hebrew Bible, which theory did, however, later exert an influence on Spinoza. The advanced thinkers of their day in all departments of knowledge, we are still indebted to the Spanish Jews for much of the form and phraseology of our modern Hebrew grammars. Inspired by the example of the Arabic scholars, they sought to apply scientific principles to the study of their own language and to formulate its laws. The verbal examination of the Hebrew Scriptures, resulting from these attempts, led some of them, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, to observe that certain passages in Genesis are inconsistent with a belief in the authorship of Moses. But this Jewish criticism did not, at the time, affect the Christian world. Taken up and expanded later by Spinoza, it played its part, but for the moment it passed unnoticed.

The Reformation aroused men's interest in religion, as the Renaissance had aroused their interest in literature and science; and as in the Renaissance men had begun to think for themselves and investigate for themselves in scientific matters, so now in the Reformation they began to think and investigate for themselves in matters of religion. Carlstadt, in 1520, published at Wittenberg an essay, in which, on the ground that the style of narration after the death of Moses

remained the same as before, he argued that it might be held that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch. Luther, like all great religious leaders, was careless of the form in comparison of the substance. Noting the reference in Genesis xxxvi. 31 to the kings who had reigned in Edom before there were any kings in Israel, he asks what it matters whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch or not, and does not investigate the question further. It was not the man who wrote the book, nor the date of its writing, but the religious content with which he was concerned. Later in the same century, Dutch, Flemish, and Spanish scholars, like Du Maes, Bonfrère, Episcopius, Pereira, and the Jesuits, took up the critical study of the Old Testament, and went much further than Carlstadt had done in pointing out evidences of additions to or editions of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings at dates later than their traditional authorship. These critics, be it observed, were all pious Churchmen.

Then came the free-thinking Hobbes in England, who, in his *Leviathan* (1651), noting the same passages which had seemed to Spanish Jews and Christian scholars inconsistent with Mosaic authorship, concluded that "Moses wrote all that he is said to have written, as, for example, the volume of the Law which is contained, as it seemeth, in the eleventh of Deuteronomy and following chapters to the twenty-seventh." He identifies this law with the law "which, having been lost, was long after found again by Hilkiah and sent to King Josiah" (2 Kings xxii. 8), following in part St. Jerome, who was the first critic to identify the law book of Josiah with Deuteronomy, but sets aside the title, "Five Books of Moses," as of no authority, and concludes that the Pentateuch, as a whole, was not his work.

Next follows De la Peyrère (1654), a French Calvinist, with his curious theory of pre-Adamite men, from whom the greater part of mankind were descended, and his literary study of the Pentateuch with this idea in mind. Using the passages which had been already used by others, and adding

a few more, he reached the conclusion that Genesis was composed out of different documents, compiled and arranged by another than Moses.

A little later (1671) Spinoza with trenchant pen discussed the chronological difficulties of the Pentateuch and the historical books. Both in his drastic method of treating the subject, and also in his conclusions, he went much further than any of his predecessors. Moses, according to him, had composed a book of commentaries on the Law, but that book was no longer extant. Deuteronomy was the law book promulgated by Ezra, as narrated in Nehemiah viii. 9, and it was Ezra who had written the "history of the Hebrew nation, from the creation of the world to the destruction of Jerusalem."

In his *Critical History of the Old Testament* (1682), Father Simon, of the Congregation of the Oratory, undertook to vindicate ecclesiastical tradition and the authority of Scripture against the speculations of philosophers like Spinoza. Nevertheless, he agrees with the latter in recognising the diversities of style, the confusions of order, and the chronological inconsistencies of the narrative of Genesis. Much after the manner of some of his Roman Catholic predecessors, and especially Du Maes, whose work he freely used, "he framed a theory of the composition of the Pentateuch out of documents drawn up from time to time by recorders or keepers of public archives under the direction of Moses."¹

Three years later the Dutch scholar, Le Clerc, published a criticism on Simon's history, in which, as already noticed, he propounded the principles of the Higher Criticism. He placed the study of the Old Testament on the same plane with all historical inquiry, demanding that the conditions under which any work was produced should be considered, the author's purpose in writing it discovered, and the events or opinions to which he alludes taken into consideration.

¹ *The Hexateuch*. By J. ESTLIN CARPENTER and G. HARFORD BATTERSBY, vol. i. p. 25. I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to this valuable work, not merely for the above quotation, but also for many suggestions and some facts utilised in this chapter.

Up to this point we have a succession of investigators recognising differences of style, inconsistencies, and contradictions of statements, chronological difficulties, and the like, incompatible with the composition of the Pentateuch in the age of Moses. We also find a general inclination to explain these phenomena by the supposition of the compilation of the Pentateuch from different documents; but no one had as yet proposed a method of distinguishing the documents. It was a French Roman Catholic physician, Jean Astruc, who furnished the first clue to the analysis of the documents in an anonymous work, published at Brussels in 1753. He observed that in the Book of Genesis the name Elohim was used for God in one set of narratives and Yahaweh in another, and that the difference in the use of the name of God corresponded with a difference in style. Accordingly, on the basis primarily of the differences of the Divine Name, he divided Genesis into two main narratives, A and B. Besides these two main narratives he found a small number of passages, apparently not belonging to either narrative, which he designated by the letters C to M. Valuable as his discovery was, for the moment his work produced no effect, and it is even doubtful whether Eichhorn, who published a somewhat similar analysis in his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, in 1780, was acquainted with his work. It is on the latter's analysis that the subsequent work of criticism is really based, and with him the investigation of the Old Testament was transferred to the schools of Germany, where it found a fertile soil and progressed rapidly. Astruc had applied his analysis only to Genesis. Eichhorn suggested that a similar method of analysis was applicable to the remainder of the Pentateuch, but did not make a successful application of his method. That was done first by an English Roman Catholic priest, Geddes (1792), who, as a result of his investigation, reached the conclusion that the Pentateuch in its present form was not written by Moses; but that it was written, probably in Jerusalem, after the time of David and not later than the reign of Hezekiah. Geddes's work

influenced very strongly Vater, of Halle, who incorporated it in his *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (1802). Vater, however, went further than Geddes in regard to date, holding that the Pentateuch as a whole was not in existence before the Exile. Then follows De Wette, inspired in his turn by Vater, with his *Contributions to the Introduction of the Old Testament* (1806). Leaving the mere literary questions which had attracted the attention of his predecessors, De Wette undertook an examination of the institutions underlying the Pentateuchal codes, and in doing this brought the whole literature of Israel under consideration. Beginning his investigations with a comparative study of the books of Chronicles and Kings, he reached the conclusion that Chronicles could not be accepted as evidence for the religious practices of Israel in the earlier periods, and that the only reliable evidence regarding those conditions was to be found in the unconscious testimony supplied in the allusions and references in Judges, Samuel, and Kings. Arguing from this basis of historical fact, he found the requirements of the Pentateuch continually ignored or violated by the people at large and their responsible leaders; and finally, as a result of this comparison of the laws with the evidence of the historical statements and allusions, he reached the conclusion that the Pentateuch contained a successive development of legislation, in which the Book of Deuteronomy could be clearly assigned to the seventh century B.C.; results which, after a generation of dormancy, as it were, are now generally accepted.

The man who first attempted a reconstruction of the history of Israel on the basis of a critical study of its literature was Heinrich Ewald (1843). Inspired, as already stated, by the work of Niebuhr in reconstructing the history of Rome, he undertook a similar reconstruction of the history of Israel. The necessary basis of his work was a critical analysis of the entire literature of Israel, for the purpose of sifting out the historical facts, arranging them in their true sequence, and determining the actual relation to one another of the events recorded or referred to. In the same spirit he undertook an

investigation of the language of Israel. He wrote a new Hebrew grammar and retranslated and rearranged, with a critical study of the text, the prophets and the poets of Israel. His work, but especially his *History of Israel*, gave a vast impulse to the critical study of the Bible everywhere. He presented that positive reconstructive element which was necessary to give life and interest to the apparently negative work of the critical investigation of the Old Testament writings. Men arose from the reading of his works with a new sense of the reality of the events narrated and a feeling of personal acquaintance with the ancient prophets and poets, whose words echoed in their ears with a meaning applicable to their own times. He had filled Hebrew history with throbbing life, and kindled everywhere a new interest in the Bible and an enthusiasm for the critical study of the Old Testament. Since his time progress has been rapid. To-day his history and many of his results are antiquated; but the ideas for which he stood in the treatment of the literature and the history of Israel now prevail among scholars everywhere.

Time would not suffice to mention the names of the scholars who have so brilliantly prosecuted the critical study of the Old Testament literature, or explored the development of the religion and institutions of the Jews in the almost half-century since Ewald's time. Within that period, moreover, the successful prosecution of such studies has been vastly promoted by the archæological discoveries which have so greatly increased our knowledge of the ancient world, and especially the ancient Semitic world, of which Israel formed a part. Since Ewald's time, also, the general application of the two principles of comparison and evolution has profoundly influenced and mightily quickened literary, historical, and religious study.

We no longer study anything by itself, but compare it with correlated experiences and phenomena. In the sphere of language-study we have the science of comparative philology. Language is compared with language. By means of this comparison we have found that there are groups of languages

closely related to one another, and comparing these groups with one another, we have discovered certain universal laws of language. Comparing further the languages within each group, we ascertain the laws common to that group. By such comparison a flood of light has been thrown on language. We know Greek and Latin and Hebrew to-day as our predecessors did not know them. Where such a comparison has been made, we are able, to some extent, to write the history of a people on the basis of its language, to determine its origin, its connexions, its experiences, habits, and civilisation ; and much more, we are able to detect dialectical differences and their significance. The same principle of comparison is now applied to the study of history, of literature, of philosophy, of ethics, of religion. Recognising the kinship of men, and their subjection to the same general laws, we realise that under similar conditions they will think and act similarly. We can compare them with one another, establish certain categories and certain laws, and thus the fragmentary records of one people may be explained and expanded by a comparison of the records of another. Why did men sacrifice ? What is the meaning of sacrifice ? We are no longer content to draw our conclusions from the laws concerning sacrifice in the Bible, or the allusions to sacrifice and the ideas connected with it in the historical books of the Old Testament, the Psalms, and the Prophets, or to confine our studies to those documents. We ask ourselves whether the sacrificial rites of the Jews were the same as or different from those of other people. We compare them one with another, seeking the general underlying laws of sacrifice, and its fundamental meaning, casting in the process light on much that was formerly dark in the Jewish record. But just as comparative philology has proved that Hebrew was not the primal language, given of God in Eden ; just as it has shown that Hebrew is one among many tongues and subject to the same laws as other tongues ; so the comparative study of history and religion must inevitably lay Hebrew history and the religion of Israel side by side with the history and the religion of

other peoples, test them by the same methods, and apply to them the same rules. This men are doing to-day.

The other great principle is evolution. Evolution, discovered by Darwin, in the world of natural phenomena, has within the last quarter of a century become an axiom of modern thought. It is impossible to-day to write a history of any sort without taking into account the doctrine of evolution; or rather unconsciously we posit evolution in the treatment of our theme. We observe everywhere an evolution taking place. Nothing occurs of itself. Every event, every opinion, every achievement is dependent upon what has preceded, and in its turn becomes the source out of which something further is evolved. This principle has given a reasonableness and a connectedness to history which it did not possess before. Viewing history thus as an evolution, we have a working hypothesis which helps us to fit events, institutions, laws, thoughts, beliefs, customs, rites, and ceremonies into their place in a great progressive series; not that the progress is always absolutely forward, but that nothing appears unconnected or unrelated. Each rite, each opinion, each belief is developed out of something which preceded it. It is the application to the study of the intellectual and moral history of the world of that which was first discerned to be God's method in the world of physical nature.

Space would not permit me to set forth in detail the results obtained by the application of modern methods of study to the investigation of the Old Testament. Be it noted that in applying such methods, in treating the Bible in that regard like other books, in applying to its exposition and elucidation the best science of the day, precisely as in the exposition of Homer, or Herodotus, or Froissart, or Shakespeare, and refusing to be bound by the interpretations or theories of the past, we are imitating the attitude of the early Church, as over against Jewish traditionalism and the Jewish doctrine of the inspiration of the letter. And be it noted further, that the present views of Bible scholars are not a mere passing fancy, nor in any sense an invention of enemies of the faith. They are the

result of a long series of development, affecting all science and all thought ; they are on all fours with the results obtained in other fields by the application of the same methods ; they are results obtained by the labours of men who love the Bible, and who have toiled to make it more intelligible and more precious to their fellow-men.

In general modern scholars have reached the conclusion that the Old Testament, in its laws and institutions, its historical narratives, and its prophetical and poetical writings, represents a gradual development. First they found four main documents in the Pentateuch and Joshua, combined by some editor into one work. Then they ascertained that these documents represented not so much individual authors as schools of thought and periods of time, and that in a general way the whole historical literature of the Hebrews was a combination of materials from different sources, handled by different schools of thought at different periods, with differing theories and differing interests. About David or Solomon's time the first Jewish chroniclers commenced their work, recording the stories and the history of their own time. They and their successors and continuators sought to gather up also the poetical fragments, the records, and the stories which had come down from the past, and combine them with their narrative. So these Jewish chronicles grew backward and forward, until they comprised the whole period, from the creation of the world to the narrator's own time. Moreover, the narrative assumed different forms under different hands, in different places with different interests. Legislation grew in a somewhat similar way from Moses' time onward. A law developed in practice, through legal decisions, adaptations to new conditions, compromises and codifications, into codes of laws, and those again into ever new codes, until in Ezra's time we have the great mass of legislation known as the Priest's code, all descended from Moses, and consequently all referred to him as its author. The Psalms grew in the same way from David's time, or even earlier, onward. To a large extent what was first found to be true of Hebrew legislation and Hebrew

historical writing is now seen to be true of Hebrew psalmody, the writings of the prophets, and the wisdom literature. The literary conventions of ancient Israel were very unlike those of the present day, and scholars now recognise that practically all the literature of Israel which has come down to us is a growth, a result of re-writing and re-editing from age to age, and especially during the centuries succeeding the Exile, with the inevitable working in of the views of the editor and his age. The problem of modern scholarship is to separate the old from the new, and to trace as accurately as may be the process of development.

Nor is this growth of Hebrew literature a thing unique. We find a similar growth among other peoples. A comparison is often made between the Pentateuch, with its four main documents, as determined by critical scholars, with the Diatessaron of Tatian, at one time in common use in the Syrian Church. Tatian made a harmony of the four Gospels, forming a consecutive story of the Life of Christ. This met with such popular approval that at one time it threatened to supplant the individual Gospels altogether in the Syrian Church. The process by which Tatian united the four Gospels is almost identical with the process by which the four great documents of the Pentateuch have been united into one; only in the former case the individual documents still continued to exist as such, and ultimately resumed their place in the Church, while in the case of the Pentateuch the individual documents were lost and the harmony alone preserved.

Valuable for the light which it throws on the growth of Hebrew legislation and the conceptions which permitted the frequent modification and enlargement of codes of laws which still continued to be ascribed to one original law-maker, Moses, is a comparison of the laws of the Pentateuch with the collections of early English laws, the dooms or judgments, put forth by the kings of Kent or Wessex. King Alfred tells us that he collected such dooms together, and "commanded many of those to be written which our fore-fathers held, those which to me seemed good; and many

of those which seemed to me not good I rejected them,— and in otherwise commanded them to be holden." Alfred's dooms begin with the Ten Commandments and the legislation of what is now known as the Book of the Covenant, Exodus xxi.—xxiii. ; but the Hebrew laws are handled with the greatest freedom, and adapted to the conditions of the time without the slightest hint that any change has been made. The dooms of Alfred are, in fact, a growth, based upon the Bible legislation, but with additions and changes, representing many ages and many hands. If we had those dooms alone, without the Bible with which to compare them, we should be sorely at a loss to determine what was taken from the Hebrew and what is of later date ; and even now it is impossible to decide what is to be ascribed to Alfred and what to his predecessors. He played in the formation of those dooms much the same part which Ezra played in the formation of the Law.

Somewhat similar to the story of Alfred's dooms is the story of the growth of the Saxon Chronicle. This was originally a series of annals, written in Latin, dealing, for the most part, with local events. Alfred undertook to make it accessible to the unlearned by a translation into the English tongue, and in the translation fresh material was added to the original Chronicle drawn from other sources. Just as the Hebrew story was carried back ultimately to the Creation, and Hebrew history made to start with that event, so this Saxon Chronicle was carried back to the Incarnation, and the history of England brought into connexion with that new Creation of the world. Neither did the Chronicle stop with Alfred's time. Copies were deposited in different monasteries, and continuators carried forward the record. Special events were noted in different places, and we have schools of chroniclers, belonging clearly to different localities, although we are quite unable to determine the individual hands by whom the different histories were written. The historical books of Israel were written in precisely the same way, except that only one compilation ultimately came down to us. The rest are lost.

Nor is it only England which, in its early laws and early history, furnishes a parallel to the growth of Hebrew laws and Hebrew historical writing. The literature of India, as we now know, was composed in a somewhat similar way, and the more extensive our knowledge of the laws and history and literature of early peoples becomes, the more examples we find of that very method of literary growth, which critical scholars of the Old Testament have ascertained to be the method of the formation of Hebrew literature.

Much work remains to be done, and the opposition to this method of treating the Old Testament is not yet entirely overcome. The ideas and the prejudices of an earlier period still remain powerful; but it may be fairly said that in the methods of study and the main results of critical analysis and historical reconstruction Bible scholars are agreed. On the other hand, it must be admitted that many questions of detail are still unsettled, and that there is a tendency among critical students of the Old Testament at the present moment to subdivide too minutely, to depend too much on speculative, subjective criteria, to discard tradition without sufficient cause, and to assign everything to a later date without discrimination.

CHAPTER VI

THE RELIGIOUS EVOLUTION OF ISRAEL

HOW you and I as children pored over the tales of the patriarchs and heroes of the Bible—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob! Ah, the tricks and cunning of Jacob! How we admired and disapproved, became unconscious partisans for or against him, the wily Odysseus of Hebrew story! And again, the tale of Joseph. Most of us were with him from beginning to end; but I am afraid that on some of us, when we were children, he made the same impression which the good heroes of Sunday-school books seem to have made on Mark Twain. We rebelled against him; he was too good. His robe of many colours and his dreams were a personal affront, and we did want to take him down a peg, because we knew that he was setting himself up as better than ourselves. And then the heroes of Israel. Oh, what a charming passage that used to be about Gideon's victory over the Midianites! I am sure some of us tried to "lap water with his tongue, as a dog lappeth." We had an idea that it would be a sort of test of energy and courage. We would have liked, too, to break one of our mother's earthen pots in the night, and swing a light, and blow a horn, and shout to scare the Midianites. That was fine! And when we read about Jephthah's vow, to sacrifice what met him when he came home, and how it fell out that his daughter met him, you remember well the involuntary comparison you made, feeling as though it must be wrong to do so, with the story of Beauty and the Beast. When you had read the story of Elisha, you felt despite yourself a sympathy with the boys who were torn to pieces by

the bears, a personal sympathy, for you had done the same thing, and you certainly did not feel that the misdeed was so terrible as to merit death. I wonder if, when you were a good child, on Sunday afternoons you were allowed to take the big Bible, turn to the Apocrypha, and read the story of Bel and the Dragon, and whether you were quite clear in your mind as to the distinction between that and some of Grimm's fairy tales?

You read those same stories now, but they are not quite the same. You surely must remember what a wonder and delight they were to you in childhood, however, and the strange meanings they conveyed to you. But they did teach you. You did not care for Amos, and Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel then, and Leviticus and Deuteronomy were dead letters. The lore of the child-world best taught the childish mind.

We have progressed ; an evolution has taken place in our religious thoughts since childhood. We have all learned now to find progress, development, evolution in all things—in ourselves, in the physical or natural world, in thought, in ethics, in civilisation, in religion. We find ourselves believing in a development of religion in the world from childhood to maturity, just as we have known it in ourselves. And we find ourselves involuntarily, almost unconsciously, comparing religious ideas, rites, and ceremonies. Such a word as Easter of itself forces comparison in our minds. The fact that the name of the greatest of Christian feasts is the name of an old Teutonic goddess leads us to think with kindness of the pagan faith which gave us that name. Christmas and All Hallowe'en are connected with customs having their acknowledged origin in paganism. A few summers since I found the Armenians celebrating the Transfiguration festival by ascending hills and mountains, and throwing water on one another. On investigation, I ascertained that both in date and mode of celebration their Transfiguration corresponded to the old Persian feast of Abrizan. The early missionaries adopted that feast bodily, and connected it with the Transfiguration, because of the practice of ascending mountains.

Whoever has travelled has seen much of this. He has seen the old pagan polytheism still surviving under Christian forms and names. On every Greek island where a fane of Apollo once crowned the heights he finds the similar St. George worshipped, while close to the sea St. Nicholas has assumed the heritage of Poseidon. On the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, opposite Therapia, you see on a high hill the Moslem sacred tomb of the huge toe of that colossal saint, Joshua son of Nun. To the Christians the same tomb was the wonder-working tomb of St. Pantaleon ; and to the heathen Greeks it was equally sacred as the Bed of Heracles. So at Smyrna Christians and Mussulmans alike worship at the tomb of Polycarp, each a different saint ; while at Baghdad the same shrine serves Jew and Moslem for the worship respectively of Joshua son of Jozedek and of St. Yusuf. Jonah has succeeded Dagon and Oannes, and Astarte has given place to St. Mary, St. Anna, and other virgin saints ; but under different names the old sacred places and something of the old worship still linger on. You see to-day the same sort of sacred trees and sacred stone-heaps which you read about alike in the sacred and profane literature of the Orient and a survival at least of the old rites connected with their cult. In Palestine religion has followed religion, but the old sacred places, and many of the ancient sacred practices, still linger on ; places and customs that were sacred long before Israel entered Canaan.

The most casual reader of the Old Testament can scarcely fail to see that Israel borrowed many of its sacred places from heathen antiquity. One city, which plays a part as a sort of sacred city in the history of the ark, and which is called a city of the Levites, is Beth Shemesh, "house of the sun-god." (There are at least two more cities of the same name in Palestine, showing the popularity of this cult.) Another Levitical city was called Anathoth, place of the goddess Anah, or Anath. Another Levitical city, which was also a sanctuary, or place of refuge for the man who had committed manslaughter, was Kedesh, which means "sanctuary." Now, as the

name existed before the Hebrew period, it is manifest that it was a sanctuary in the pre-Israelitic times. Qishon was a sacred river before the time of the Israelites, bearing the name of an obscure divinity, Qish, or Qaish, which also appears in the name of the father of Saul, and which we meet among the heathen Arabs; and from the song of Deborah we find that this river retained some sort of reputation for sanctity among the Israelites of her day. Indeed, in a land where fountains and perennial streams are rare, all such tend to be held sacred and regarded as special manifestations of a divine force. So the Jordan was sacred, and more particularly its fountain-sources at the foot of Hermon, from the most remote antiquity. This sanctity was taken over by the Hebrews, and this it was which led to the erection at Dan, the sacred sources of Jordan, of one of the two great temples of northern Israel. Long after that temple had vanished, under a different cult, the sources of Jordan were sacred to Pan, and the remnants of a shrine of that god exist there to this day, while the place itself is still called Banias, after the name of Pan. A curious and interesting reference to the sanctity of the spot and its fountains is contained in Psalm xlii. Compare with this that ancient song of a well in the Book of Numbers (xxi. 17, 18), beginning, "Spring up, well; sing ye to it." Hermon itself was an ancient sacred mountain (its name means "devoted," or "separated"), as was also Carmel, and, in general, every isolated, high hill. It is interesting to find two mountains sacred from the earliest time, one of them certainly from pre-Israelitic times, namely Nebo and Sinai, bearing names familiar in Babylonia. Nebo is the name of the god Nebo, or Nabu, the god of prophecy, whose name forms a component part of the royal names, Nebuchadrezzar, Nabonidus, etc. The other, Sinai, bears the name of the ancient moon-god, Sin, the especial god of Ur, the birthplace of Abraham.

The permanence of locality in connexion with worship is a well-established fact. A place or object once regarded as holy will retain its sanctity, even though the religion

which sanctified it and the ceremonies of its cult change entirely.

And now, having considered places of worship, let us note some points connected with the manner of worship of God. All flesh-eating was sacrifice in early times. We have an example of the primitive Hebrew idea regarding this in the case of Saul after the victory over the Philistines near Mich-mash (1 Sam. xiv. 31 ff.). His men were very hungry, and began to kill and eat without any recognition of God. Saul was horrified, and setting up a stone as the representation of Deity, caused them to bring and kill the beasts there, the blood being poured out upon or before the stone, which thus received it for God. This conception of all flesh-eating as sacrifice still survives among the Arabs, even town Arabs, in language, and, to some extent, in fact. My workmen often asked me to "sacrifice" an ox or a sheep for them. And if I went to a chief's camp a sheep was "sacrificed" for me. So also people, both Christians and Moslems, sacrifice a sheep at some *ziara*, inviting all to eat of the flesh; and the flesh eaten on such occasions is practically the only flesh that the common people eat. Leviticus xvii. shows a similar condition among the ancient Hebrews. The Hebrew name for altar, it will be noticed, is "place of killing," and this, together with the fact that the words for kill and sacrifice are the same, is in itself sufficient evidence of the early Hebrew idea. But as early as the Book of Deuteronomy these primitive conditions change, giving place to a higher and more luxurious method of life.

The early idea of God as connected by blood with the worshipper lends itself to the idea of God as the head of the family, or family gods; of which we see a trace in Jonathan's excuse for David's absence from Saul's table, viz. that he had to go to take part in a family sacrifice. A little higher in the scale of advancing civilisation is a tribal god, then a national, and from this one advances a further step to true monotheism. The popular religion of Israel up to the time of the written prophets had not advanced beyond the national stage, and we

find abundant traces of the family, clan, and tribal stages. Some of the Divine names which we find in use may connect themselves with such tribal and family uses. I have already pointed out that Kish is a Divine name; so also are David and Solomon. Again, we find appellatives used as the names of Divinity, thus Ab, "father" as in Abram; Melech, "king" (written in late Hebrew usage, "Moloch" when used of a separate Deity, by way of differentiation), as Melchizedek; Baal, Adonis, etc.

Again, we find a localisation of the Divinity. We find this in one form in the idea that Yahaweh, or Yehu, was specially connected with the soil of Palestine, as when David says that if Saul drive him out of the land, he drives him away from the face of Yahaweh, and forces him to worship the gods of the land to which he shall flee (1 Sam. xxvi. 19). Or when Naaman begs some of the soil of Israel, that he may worship the God of Israel in Damascus (2 Kings v. 17). Another form of localisation is the attaching to certain places of a peculiar sanctity as dwelling-places, or haunts, or places of special manifestation of the Divinity. So Bethel is the house of God, the gate of the heavens (Gen. xxviii. 17). Fountains are peculiarly sacred as places where God comes forth from the earth to men, like Beersheba and Dan. High places, as places where He comes down from the heavenly to the earthly heights. All are familiar with the high places, the *bamoth* of pre-prophetic times in Israel and Judah, and I have already pointed out how many of these holy places were inherited from pre-Israelitic times. But not only the places, the cults also were inherited. All this naturally resulted in a practical polytheism. Indeed, the conditions were in many respects comparable with those in Spain, Italy, Russia, Greece, and Turkey at the present day. The virgin of this place and the virgin of that, the white virgin and the black virgin, are exactly paralleled by the Assyrian Ishtar of Arbela, Ishtar of Nineveh, Ishtar of Erech, etc. In Spain a common man holds more holy in practice the local saint at whose shrine he offers prayer in all his need, and whose relics have wrought

those miracles of which he often hears and whose evidence he sees, than the Christ by whose name he calls himself. He might swear falsely by Christ, but scarcely by the relics of his local saint, or virgin. So it is in Islam. Some of our men stole antiquities. They were examined by the oath on the Koran, and the chief culprit, a specially holy man, who bore the title Hajji, as one who had made the pilgrimage to Mecca, swore falsely. Then they were all taken to the local shrine of a dead saint, unknown except in that region ; but of that oath the culprit was afraid. So it was among the Hebrews. Remember, for example, the oath of Beersheba. In other words, there was practical polytheism. And yet in the same way in which a Spanish or a Mesopotamian peasant would to-day tell you that he is a monotheist, the average Hebrew would and could have told you the same thing. He had, in a vague and inconsistent way, an idea of a divine something underlying everything. He would tell you of the heroes who were sons of the gods and the daughters of men ; but the gods of his thought were superhuman beings, rather than the Deity itself. He was at once a monotheist and a polytheist. Of course, when brought into direct contact with foreign polytheisms, he was in danger of accepting polytheism outright, as we find it adopted in the days especially of Amon and Manasseh. And yet it must be admitted that even a gross polytheism, like that of India, or that of Assyria, shows a monotheistic thought prevailing in the more spiritual and mystic interpretations of its forms and doctrines.

Every early religion shows the worship of nature, and naturally. It is the simplest development of the animistic idea which underlies all primitive religious thought. The various processes of nature seem to involve a life behind them. The bubbling fountain, the flowing stream, the tree that grows as a man grows, and puts forth twigs and leaves and fruit, and dies and rises again—do not these show a life as real as the life of man? And if separate from his body there exists a soul, a life principle, must there not be such a spiritual existence to explain their life, inhabiting them as

its body, and perhaps perishing with their death? Here, of course, you have the Greek dryads, nymphs, etc. Again, the motions of the heavenly bodies, and their relation to the world and the affairs of men, gave rise to the belief in mighty spiritual powers inhabiting and informing those bodies. In late Hebrew writings, of the period beginning with the close of the Exile, you see a conception of spirits of the heavenly bodies, which correspond to certain earthly existences. But this seems to be drawn from Babylonian and Persian ideas, and not to be a native Hebrew development. Similarly the worship of the heavenly bodies seems to be borrowed from without. In their treatment of the spirits of trees, fountains, and the like, the Hebrews, and indeed the Semites in general, differ from the Greeks. The sacred tree, the fountain, the sacred stone, the cherubim, and the like are inhabited by Divinity, but underlying this polytheism there is a monotheistic idea. Again, there are spiritual existences—satyrs, *shedim*, *azazel*, spirits whom Yahaweh sends out, angels; but all is vague and unformulated, and by that very fact we escape definite, theological polytheism, mythology, or even demonology. The latter grows up later under foreign influences grafted on the original Hebrew thought-stock. But nature-worship is strongly felt. Pictures like those of Psalms xviii. and xxix. are not mere poetic figures. Yahaweh especially manifests Himself in the thunderstorm. The thunder is His voice. He inhabits a central place in the midst of the darkness of the storm-clouds. The lightning is the glimpse of the brightness of His presence. He rides in the storm. The clouds are the heavenly cherubim, containers of His presence. In the Temple this idea was represented by the mysterious dark chamber, the Holy of Holies, where He dwelt. Ezekiel, even, distinctly recognises this meaning, and this connexion between thunder-cloud and Holy of Holies.

But Semitic nature-worship particularly took the form of worship of the reproductive powers of nature, and developed in directions which we regard as obscene. The dualism of sex is very prominent in Semitic polytheism. We know

this for the Babylonian from Greek writers, and also from the numberless obscene symbols and figures unearthed on every old Babylonian site. Phœnician and Aramaean practices we know from Greek writers and from the Bible to have been obscene. What about the Hebrews? We find among them, according to the testimony of the Bible, practices which we know were connected with obscenity among other nations, like the lamentation for Tammuz. Again, we find that in the Temple at Jerusalem the same abominations were practised in Josiah's day which we find among the Phœnicians and Syrians in Astarte or Ashteroth worship, and it is possible that the narrative must be interpreted as meaning that these abominations had been practised ever since Solomon's time, *i.e.* during the whole period of the existence of the first Temple, with a brief intermission in Hezekiah's day. It is ordinarily supposed that these abominations were directly borrowed from other religions. The *mazzebah* and *asherah*, conventionalised symbols, must, however, be recognised as part of the common Semitic inheritance. The *asherah* is a tree, or else a conventionalised representation of a tree, a mere pole. The *mazzebah* was a stone object. They were finally expelled from Yahaweh worship in the prophetic period.

Circumcision belongs in origin to the same general category; but it is difficult to tell how much, if any, of its original significance existed for even the very earliest Hebrew times. It appears as a sacred national mark, and assumes the form of a blood covenant. It is not apparently an original Semitic practice, but something derived from Egypt.

The great feasts of the Hebrews are in so far akin to nature-worship as that they are connected with events of nature, the yield of the earth. In a general way they can be paralleled by the feasts of other peoples. With these natural events are combined, in the case of the Passover and Tabernacles, certain historical reminiscences. The new moon, a very popular feast, but not equally recognised in legislation, is more distinctly a nature-feast. It is, however, of universal observance, and not merely Semitic. The sanctity of seven,

and apparently also of the Sabbath, appears in Babylonia as well as among the Jews.

The idea of clean and unclean is a universal primitive idea, and in many of the details of their laws of clean and unclean we find the Hebrews in close accord with other Semitic peoples. It would, in reality, be better described as a custom of *taboo* than of clean or unclean. The touching of a holy thing made a man unclean as much as the touching of an un-holy or anti-holy thing. What we call unclean was a thing set apart from man's use, not necessarily unclean in the ordinary sense of that word. Both the connexion of Hebrew use with that of other Semitic peoples, and also the peculiarities of the Hebrew use itself, are well illustrated in the matter of unclean, or *taboo* articles of food. The swine was in general *taboo* among the Semites, but that *taboo* was in its origin due to the sanctity, not the uncleanness of the creature. Sayce, in his Hibbert lectures on Babylonian religion, has pointed out from the inscriptions the peculiar sanctity or *taboo* of the swine at Nippur. This was corroborated by our excavations; for we found the boar a favourite object of votive tablets for the Temple of Bel. It enjoyed a peculiar sanctity, and therefore was forbidden to be eaten as ordinary food of men. In the list of forbidden animals among the Hebrews occurs the coney, or rock badger (*shaphan*). This creature we find to have been sacred in the neighbourhood of Sinai. The hare, forbidden to the Hebrews, we find as a sacred animal among some at least of the other Semitic peoples. The origin of this sanctity in the case of the swine and hare may have been fecundity, which, with the tendency among the Semites to the worship of the reproductive powers of nature, would naturally lead to their sanctification or *taboo*. Among the Hebrews, with their tendency away from nature-worship, the fact of *taboo* remained after the cause had disappeared, and the animals became unclean in our sense of the word unclean, un-holy and polluting. The *taboo* on other creatures in the Hebrew lists was due to various causes: sometimes to old religious uses, sometimes to dirty habits, sometimes to frightful

or disgusting appearance, sometimes to the great value of the creatures for other purposes, or to their rarity. Such laws of clean and unclean all nations and localities possess, only in an unformulated condition. Compare the common feeling among English and Americans about frogs, snails, horseflesh, and the like. The Hebrew put everything on the basis of religion, and indeed all primitive societies do so now. The words of a Turkish provincial governor to me furnish a good example of this. I was dining with him in his so-called palace. He gave me a spoon, but was himself obliged by his "religion," as he said, to eat with his fingers. We should have said custom, habit, or training where he said religion.

The question of the *taboo*, or the clean and unclean, brings us to the relations of God and man and the conception of sin. The common conception of sin in the mind of the ordinary primitive Hebrew, much like that in the mind of any primitive, uncivilised or semi-civilised man, was that of offending God by breaking some of those rules which we should regard as external and arbitrary. The prophetic writings show us very distinctly that such was the popular idea of sin. It was the breach of such laws which aroused the anger of God. You find the same conception in the Babylonian penitential psalms. There is a bitter, heart-rending cry of sin; but when you ask what is the sin, you find it to be the breach of what we should call ceremonial laws. It is a sin against moral standards only in a secondary degree, as they may be regarded as involved in that ceremonial law. The God whose laws of clean and unclean, or the like, have been broken is wroth, and inflicts sickness, trouble, distress. Such distress is itself an evidence of the wrath of God, and hence of sin. In Hebrew, the same word, rendered sometimes in our Bible "guilt," is used for sin and calamity. A man may have sinned, as he knows by the fact that calamity has come upon him, and yet not know his sin. So the Babylonian psalmist cries—

"O God, the sin that I know not forgive !
O Goddess, the sin that I know not, forgive !"

The Book of Job shows us in its argument a prevalence among the Hebrews of this same conception, against which the writer argues. The same idea also underlies the references to "secret sins," in Psalms; and in Leviticus iv. we find a special ritual (the guilt offering) for appeasing God when calamity shows that a sin has been committed, because of which God is wroth, and yet the sufferer does not know wherein he has sinned.

Among the Hebrews the punishments and rewards of sin must be given in this life. There is no proper immortality. Their idea of the condition after death is derived from the bloodless, sad appearance of the corpse, just as among the early Greeks and among the kindred Semitic peoples; a conception which appears among many primitive peoples. You will remember the consultation of the shades in the *Odyssey*, and the necessity of giving them blood to drink before they could speak. There was not annihilation, but a bloodless, gloomy existence, such as is described in the Babylonian poem of the descent of Ishtar into Hades. The spirits of the dead might be consulted, as in the story of Saul and the Witch of Endor. Great honour, amounting in some cases almost to worship, was paid to the tombs of the dead, as, for instance, the tombs of Abraham, Isaac, Joseph, and Rachel, in the same way and to the same extent as among the Moslem Arabs of to-day. This never, however, reached a worship of ancestors, or even approximated to it. The honour of a man hereafter, and his comfort also, to some extent certainly, depended upon his tomb. It was the greatest misfortune to be cast out unburied. Compare the story of Rizpah and her sons (2 Sam. xxi.), and the dirge of Jehoiakim in the book of Jeremiah (xxii. 18). Such immortality as there was depended roughly on the preservation of the integrity of the corpse. Presumably the same methods of burying food and other objects with the dead prevailed among the Hebrews as among the Babylonians.

And now a word about the methods and media of communication with God and the spirit world. Ritual is the code

regulating the relations between man and the spiritual existences. The animistic conception is, as I have already said, fundamental in primitive religions. Now when man has reached the point of belief in the existence of spiritual existences lying behind material things, he must inevitably seek the means of communicating with those existences. The mysterious occurrences of nature are connected with the good and evil which befall him and traced to these unseen, but evidently powerful agencies. It becomes a matter of supreme moment, therefore, to enter into friendly relations with these agencies, and to find the means of controlling, or at least propitiating them. Here, as elsewhere, man reasons about what is outside of himself from his own analogy. What he likes the spirit will like, and *vice versa*. (Sometimes, however, he reasons by an inverse process, ascribing to the spiritual agencies a nature the opposite of his own. In any case, he reasons and must reason from his own analogy.) All things are full of latent meanings, revealing the spiritual agencies within, or behind them. Anything unusual is a portent. Moreover, as each mishap proceeds in some way from these spiritual agencies, each mishap presumably has its portent and warning. A man sets out on an expedition, and meets with ill luck. Why? A hare had run across his path. That is the only incident he has noticed, because it had never befallen him before. He at once concludes that this was a portent of ill luck. The idea once started is accepted as a fact and handed on through indefinite ages ; not reasoned about, but accepted as a fact.

A modern illustration of this acceptance of a custom as a fact without investigation is well supplied by the famous story of Bismarck and the guard on the grass plot at St. Petersburg. When visiting St. Petersburg Bismarck noticed a guard stationed on a grass plot near nothing, and apparently guarding nothing. Finally he asked the Czar why the guard was stationed there. The Czar, when his attention was called to the position of the guard, whom, if he had noticed, he must have seen hundreds of times

before, was unable to explain it, and found himself on consideration equally surprised with Bismarck. He summoned an officer, and asked of him an explanation of the guard, with much the same result. No one knew why the guard stood on the grass plot. The Czar becoming interested to fathom this mystery, after considerable investigation it was discovered that during the reign of some previous Czar the Czarina had discovered the first violet in the middle of that grass plot. The then Czar had stationed a guard there to prevent people from trampling on the violet, and the guard once established had continued by force of custom ever since, although there were no longer any violets to guard. The fact that something is a custom, or that it is established by tradition, or that it is ordered by authority, is far more potent with the immense majority of men than reason. They do not reason; they accept what has come to them on authority, through tradition, or by custom.

Ritual, as already stated, is in its origin the etiquette of man in dealing with spiritual agencies. Now since the spiritual agencies are merely spiritualised men, or men projected in fancy into spiritual existence, the etiquette of primitive man with the spiritual agencies is naturally based on his etiquette with his fellow-men. By religious conservatism this etiquette, which was that in use among primitive men, and the customs contingent upon this etiquette, are continued in dealings with the spiritual agencies long after they have ceased to be observed among men. This is well illustrated by the continued use of flint knives for religious purposes long after metal had come into existence for every other use, a continuance observed in Hebrew ritual, where we find flint knives used for circumcision long after metal had come into use for the daily purposes of life. An excellent modern example of this religious conservatism was furnished me in an experience with a Russian priest. Acting as interpreter for one of our bishops, I went into the Holy of Holies, where the priest exhibited to us the method in which everything was done, as also the vestments used for

special occasions, some of which were of extraordinary beauty and richness. The Bishop noticed that these garments were fastened by cords and tapes, and that even the cuffs were put on in what seemed to us a very awkward manner by twisting a cord around the arm. He requested me to ask the priest why they did not use buttons. "Oh," said the priest, "all we have has come down from apostolic times; the apostles did not use buttons." Modern clerical dress is in its way a survival of the same sort, except that it does not come down from the apostolic times. The same high vests and collarless coats of black which constitute the so-called clerical dress of our clergy of to-day are the regular costume of the higher Turkish officials in Constantinople. European dress was adopted in official circles in Constantinople during the time of Mahmoud, at which time clothes of this cut were in fashion. The fashions have changed since then, but the Turkish officials and our clergy have not changed. A still more pronounced case of the same sort is the knee-breeches and gaiters worn by our higher dignitaries, which come down from a somewhat more remote period. Our ecclesiastical vestments are a survival of the same kind, but still more ancient.

But, to turn from modern examples to the study of the ritual of older periods, it should be noticed that ritual antedates mythological tales and theological explanations. This is a familiar fact in all religions, and no student of religion hesitates to understand certain tales and certain theological explanations which he meets with in those religions as due to ritual practices, which some later-thinking age has endeavoured to explain. The same phenomenon is to be met with in Hebrew history. The brazen serpent is older than the story of the brazen serpent, and many incidents in the lives of the patriarchs are but the explanations of ritual facts connected with certain localities in Palestine. You find in Hebrew ritual, as in the ritual of every other primitive people, survivals which have come down from prehistoric times, examples of the *appendix vermiciformis*, as

it were, as well as ancient practices entirely inconsistent with the general principles of the ritual in which they are embedded. As examples of such survivals and manifest inconsistencies in Hebrew ritual I may mention the scapegoat and Azazel. A phenomenon of much interest in the study of ritual and the primitive law connected with ritual is the resemblances existing between the practices of regions which can have no possible connexion one with another. The practice of levirate marriage, laws for which we find in the Book of Deuteronomy, seems to be so peculiar in its nature that the student naturally supposes it to be a Hebrew development dissimilar to anything else; but we find precisely the same provisions in the laws of Manu in India. Similarly there are a number of most curious and close coincidences between the provisions of the code of the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xxi.-xxiii.) and the oldest Greek and Roman laws. Anyone who will take up a good modern commentary will be surprised to find how many of the provisions of that old code are identical with the provisions of the Ten Tables at Rome, the old Solonic code of Athens, or the laws of Lycurgus at Sparta. It will be observed that the resemblance is always closest in the oldest strata, and this is due not to any primitive contact between the different peoples, but to the similar development of ideas which are natural to the human race.

Animism, the idea that there is a spirit in everything which exists, is universal, because man of necessity begins to study the universe from himself. He measures outside objects by his own body, in feet and fingers and ells. He counts by his body, making a decimal system out of the number of fingers on his hands and toes on his feet. So also, when he has realised the existence of a vital principle within himself, in some sort distinct from his body, an *anima*, he attributes to everything which he sees a similar spirit, through which it lives and acts. It is by a similar natural process of reasoning that he arrives at similar ritual results and propounds similar laws. But as he develops further he tends to differentiate,

and so in the higher strata of religious development the differences become more marked than the resemblances. The laws of Manu, the early Hebrew, Roman, and Greek laws resemble one another, or are in many cases identical, because in the earlier stages of development the minds of the Indians, the Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Romans worked in the same way, and according to the same fundamental principles.

But to return to Hebrew ritual, we find upon analysing that ritual that besides the general primitive and universal rites and laws, there are certain practices which are best paralleled by Arabic use, because they are a survival from the nomadic period of Hebrew history. There is, again, a great body of ritual which is identical with, or very similar to that of the Phoenicians, because it was taken over from the Canaanites along with the holy places at which it was observed, which, as we have already seen, were inherited by the Hebrews from their predecessors. The Marseilles sacrificial tables show us that a number of the sacrificial terms and rites in use among the Hebrews were identical with those in use among the Phoenicians. In the name for priest there is a curious evidence of a struggle between Syrian and Phoenician influences. The Phoenician name for the priests was *Kohanim*, the Syrian name *Kemarim*. Both names were in use among the Hebrews, but the name of *Kohanim* finally prevailed, and that of *Kemarim* came to be applied to the priests of the high places, until at length it was used as a term of reproach and opprobrium indicating false worshipping. Still another stratum of the law shows a close connexion with Babylonia. In the matter of the construction of the Temple we find a striking resemblance between Hebrew, Phoenician, and Syrian uses, and the excavation of Babylonian temples shows us that all these are modifications of a more primitive type existing there and in Southern Arabia. The Holy of Holies was not peculiar to the Hebrews, and the pillars of Jachin and Boaz, which stood before the Hebrew Temple, also stood before Phoenician and Syrian temples, and may be found in a somewhat more primitive form in Arabia. The arrangement of the

Hebrew Temple, by which one progressed inward and upward from court to court until the mysterious Holy of Holies was reached, was common to it with the temples of the Phœnicians and Syrians, and was derived apparently from Babylonian sources. The altar standing in the court in front of the holy place is the common usage of the Semitic world. The priests and prophets of Israel have sometimes been spoken of as characteristic features of the religious life of the Hebrews. But they are the same, in outer form at least, as the priests and soothsayers of the Phœnicians and the Syrians.

It may be asked, If in all these respects Hebrew religion is identical with the religion of the nations round about, if it has rites which may still be found among the nomadic Arabs, if it has such a body of ritual which it has taken over from the Phœnicians or the Babylonians, what is there that is national, what is there that is peculiar to the Hebrews, and what part did that Moses play to whom we have been accustomed to ascribe the foundation of Israel? Moses was, in fact, as the Bible states, the author of both the national life and the national religion of Israel. In European vine regions they take the American wild vine stock, and when it has taken root and grown strong and healthy, they graft upon it some fine variety of cultivated grape. The life and vigour are the life and vigour of the primitive American wild vine, but the fruit is derived from the new graft which dominates the wild stock upon which it has been grafted. Something like that took place in Israel. On the wild stock of its prehistoric ritual was grafted a new and nobler element. This is Moses. Later, others, following the example and working in the spirit of Moses, took grafts from him and grafted them on the Canaanite stock as he had been grafted on the stock of the prehistoric ritual. In this way and in this sense the whole body of Hebrew ritual became Mosaic; the Mosaic principle was grafted on the stock of common forms. To illustrate how this was done, let me use one example only. We read much of the ark in Hebrew story, but the ark is not peculiar to the Hebrews. It was used in Egypt and in Babylonia also.

It was the ship for the transportation of the divinity or his symbols. Taking such ship or ark, Moses placed in it, instead of an image symbolising divinity, two tables of stone containing the ten words. In ritual practice, at least until the time of its capture by the Philistines, this ark was carried about by the Israelites in the same way in which other peoples carried their god and his symbols ; but the symbol here used, the two tables containing the ten words, constantly pointed away from images of God in the form of man or of some beast toward God as law, and His service as obedience to that law.

It should be remembered, by the way, that ritual codes are not in antiquity separated from what we call moral, civil, and social laws. So in the Pentateuch we have ritual, moral, and social laws combined in one whole, ascribed to God as the inspirer and Moses as the inspired author. He is the inspired author in the sense which I have pointed out ; but when you ask in detail what was the ritual practice of Moses, what rites can we trace back to him, what laws and what institutions can we ascribe to him, you ask a question that probably never can be answered. He bound a quantity of families and tribes together into a loose form of national life by a certain bond of brotherhood ; he took their ancient rites, usages, and laws, and unified them, grafted a mystical spirituality upon them, and left them to develop unto fruitage. In studying the ritual codes in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, we are met everywhere by representations of the wilderness. The whole temple ritual is schemed out as though originating in the wilderness. The ritual ordinances are presented in the form of a story connected with the wandering in the wilderness. Very little study is needed to show anyone the impossibility of this in a literal sense, but it must not be lost sight of that this tradition is founded on fact. The foundations which Moses laid were laid while Israel was still a wanderer. It was in the days of their wandering that Moses established a monotheistic worship, with one central symbol and one central place of worship. But one central place of worship was not laid down as a law ; it was a mere ritual fact

arising out of the conditions under which Israel existed in that day.

Other practices which we can probably trace back to Moses would involve—in a settled community covering any considerable extent of country—numerous places of worship; for instance, the order to bring every beast that was to be slain for eating and kill it before the tabernacle. The natural result of this was that when Israel became a settled community, sacrifices were offered at many shrines. Israel sought to be close to its God, and the pious Hebrews brought their animals and slew them before the shrine of their own neighbourhood in accordance with the provisions of the ancient law of the wilderness. At a later date, when stress was laid on the other idea of having one sanctuary, it was necessary to modify this law, or rather to substitute for it a new law, in accordance with which it was permitted to kill animals to eat anywhere, and the people were told that they might eat them without offering any part unto God. The very conflict which we find in the history of Israel is in itself an evidence of the Mosaic origin of the two institutions, or rather that Moses laid down certain principles which in the conditions of the wilderness naturally involved both institutions, and that in the period after the wilderness, the people following the external side of the law rather than its spirit, the conflict ensued which we have seen. Again, Moses established the principle of monotheism, but he did not lay the stress upon one special name for God which should be a peculiar mark of Israel. This left the way open to polytheism at a later date, through the use of many names for God; but on the other hand, prepared the way for the foundation of a universal, as over against a national and local religion. We must also attribute the foundation of the Hebrew priesthood to Moses. Aaron was an historical character, and his priestly functions as a contemporary of Moses are historical; but the later attribution of Aaronic descent to all the priests cannot be accepted literally, and the Bible itself is the best evidence that it is not to be accepted literally. Priests are in all nations a pre-

historic institution, for the office of priest is the necessary outcome of the attempt to provide media of communication with spiritual agencies, which attempt, as we have seen, began before the dawn of history. But a priesthood once established tends to become a caste; the office becomes hereditary, and little by little the priesthood assumes to itself ever new powers. This, which is the common history of the priesthood in all religions, is the history of the priesthood in Israel also.

One of the most perplexing points in the study of the Hebrew priesthood is the origin and position of the tribe of Levi. The word Levi apparently means "bound," or "attached to." There is, however, much uncertainty as to the true explanation of the term. Some have supposed that it means bound, or attached to the sanctuary, and that Levi was not properly a tribe, but merely a designation for those who were bound, or attached to the sanctuary. There are apparently contradictions in the Bible narrative. In Genesis xlix. Levi is mentioned as a tribe, but in other passages we hear of Levites from the tribe of Judah and from Ephraim. From the earliest times special sanctity was attributed to Levites, although members of other tribes could officiate as priests, as we see from the story of Micah (Judges xvii.). In the Book of Deuteronomy all priests are designated as Levites and all Levites as priests. After the Exile we find priests and Levites distinguished the one from the other. In the post-Exilic period Levites are confused with Nethinim, "those who were given," that is, slaves, or descendants of the slaves of the sanctuary. This confusion suggests to us that what happened at this time might have happened before, and that the tribe of Levi in the bulk may very well have been descended from those who had been in one way or another given to the service of the sanctuary. It ought to be added that in the period immediately succeeding the Exile the distinction between Levites and Nethinim is carefully observed. At that period also we find temple singers constituting guilds, apparently outside of the Levites. At a later date all distinction is lost; the Nethinim and the

various guilds of singers and porters are merged in the Levites.

In the early times of all peoples the priesthood is important, not only on its ritual side, but also in social and civil life. The priests are the depositaries and interpreters of traditions, customs, rites, etc. In all early codes, in all countries, the appeal for decision is to God. If there is no precedent which determines in a given case what shall be done, then God must be appealed to to establish one. If there be a question of veracity between two persons, God must be appealed to to decide. What we find among all other nations we find also among the Hebrews. In the early Hebrew codes questions not capable of other decision are referred to God. The word God is used in the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xxi.-xxiii.) in a sense which we are practically compelled to translate as "judge"; but God was a judge through the medium of the priest, and the shrine at which the priest officiated was the court of justice. Out of the fact that the appeal was made to God through the priest the priest became the law-maker. First he interpreted God to man in his decisions, then he became the depositary of tradition and custom and of the decisions of the past, and then he became the codifier of these customs and traditions in the form of laws. And because priests were what I have described, they became also the conservers of knowledge to the people, the writers and recorders of the nation.

In the earliest times the priest was not especially the sacrificer; his function was to act as the regular interpreter of God. Ritual functions were, however, increasingly assumed by the priests as time went on. In early times among the Hebrews, as among practically all nations, any man could sacrifice. It was the function of the head of the family, of the chief of the tribe, of the king of the nation. So we find Gideon and Manoah sacrificing in the Book of Judges, Saul officiating as chief priest when his men sacrificed for eating after the slaughter of the Philistines, David sacrificing as the head of the nation, Elijah, the prophet, sacrificing for the

people, Uzziah, the king, sacrificing in the Temple at Jerusalem. There is also in the usage of the Passover an interesting and instructive survival of the custom by which the head of the household was the sacrificer for the household. We find the same thing in Moslem sacrifices. In course of time, as the priests assumed ritual functions, the right of sacrifice was limited among the Hebrews, as elsewhere. We find traces of this progress in the historical books, where the original facts and later stories of the theologians are sometimes curiously combined, as in the case of Samuel's rebuke of Saul (1 Sam. xiii. 9 ff.), which everyone who has read the passage must have felt to be peculiarly illogical and unjust under the circumstances described, although it becomes perfectly clear when we analyse the document critically. On the same plane stands the story of Dathan and Abiram, in Numbers xvi. With this, in the form in which we have it, has been combined the story of Korah, in which we have pictured the struggle between the priests and the Levites. But the best known of all the notices in the Bible, and that which is put at the latest date, is the story of Uzziah, who was smitten with leprosy for executing the office of a priest in the Temple (2 Chron. xxvi. 21-23). The most naïve picture of all the accounts of assumption of power on the part of the priest which we find is that contained in the account of the priests of Shiloh, in 1 Samuel ii. This story, in the form in which we have it, is in itself very early. Here we are told that in the older time it had been the custom when a man sacrificed, after the blood had been poured out and perhaps some portion of the sacrifice had been actually burned by fire to God, for him to cut up the animal and put it in the pot to cook, in order that he and his family or friends might feast upon it before God. While it was still in the pot, the priest or his servant would come and thrust a fork into the pot, and whatever was secured by that thrust became the property of the priest. It is a cause of bitter complaint that the sons of Eli are violating this ancient and immemorial practice, and insisting upon taking a definite and probably larger portion

of the animal sacrificed before it had been put in the pot at all.

The variety of places of worship among the Hebrews was a necessary result of the application of the ritual practices of the nomadic period to the changed conditions of the settled life in Palestine and the more extended territory which was occupied ; so that, for example, in Leviticus xvii., which I regard as containing in principle legislation of the earliest stratum, it is forbidden to kill any creature to eat, except before the sanctuary, for all eating is sacrifice, and every creature which is slain must be slain before God. To carry out this principle when the camp had turned into a nation occupying a large territory involved the establishment of innumerable sanctuaries, and we find the Jews throughout the historical period until the time of Josiah worshipping and sacrificing at innumerable sanctuaries.

The necessary result of the establishment of the kingdom was a tendency toward the centralisation of worship. The great number of small shrines, acting as so many rival local centres, tended on the whole to disintegrate the nation. If the nation was to be centralised under one individual, its worship must be centered also, either in his person or under his control, at the place of his residence. David, according to the account given in the books of Samuel, was head of the Jewish Church in a far more absolute sense than to-day the Czar of Russia is the head of the Russian Church, or the Sultan the head of Islam. David himself was a sacrificer, and not only did he sacrifice as head of his family and head of the nation, but he appointed his sons priests (2 Sam. viii. 18), just as in the Book of Judges we are told that Micah appointed his son a priest (Judges xvii. 5). Both for the purpose of restoring that which was ancient and holy in Israel, and also for the purpose of obtaining special sanctity for the sacred place that was near his person, David restored the Ark which had for many years been resting in desuetude and oblivion. Two chief priests are mentioned in the history of David as officiating at the same time, Abiathar and Zadok. In reading the

account in the books of Samuel of the activities of Abiathar it will be observed that there is little or nothing about sacrifice, but very much about the casting of the lots. At the time of David the primitive conception of the priest still prevailed ; his special function was not to sacrifice, but to interpret the oracles of God and cast the sacred lots. A survival of this ancient function of the priesthood is found in the Urim and Thummim, which are special marks of the high priest in the later periods of Judaism. After the casting of the lots had ceased to be his special work, the lots themselves remained as a sort of insignia of office, indicating what the origin of the priest had been. But David had in his immediate surroundings not merely priests, but also prophets, and in this regard he differed in no respect from kings of the surrounding nations, Phœnicians, and Syrians. Among these peoples also you find both priests and soothsayers, and this duplicity of the interpretation of God to men has survived in the Orient until this day, so that in Islam you find the division into the Ulema, the representatives of the priesthood of earlier times and other peoples, and the Dervishes, who are the soothsayers and prophets. As between priest and prophet we might define the former as the regular, the latter as the extraordinary medium of communication between God and man.

Solomon carried the centralisation of worship much further than his father, and the erection of his great Temple at Jerusalem marks a most important step in the development of the religion of Israel. That Temple had the most far-reaching results in relation not merely to the ritual, but also to more fundamental parts of the religion. The Temple itself, in its architecture and symbolism, may be called identical with the temples of the nations round about. The Hittite temple described in one of the inscriptions of Sargon of Assyria, and the famous Hittite-Syrian temple at Hierapolis, near Carchemish, so far as we can judge, were of the same general character as the Temple of Solomon. What little we know about Phœnician temples shows the most striking analogies between them and the Temple of Solomon, and the excavation of ancient Baby-

Ionian temples shows us, as already pointed out, the same fundamental principles in use in Babylonia and at Jerusalem. The Holy of Holies, the succession of courts one above the other, leading up ultimately to the mysterious inner place where the invisible God dwelt in darkness, the form and place of the altar, the strange columns before the Temple, called by the Jews Jachin and Boaz—all these are features common to the Jewish Temple, with the temples of Phoenicia, Syria, Assyria, and Babylonia.

The Temple of Solomon was a great cathedral for the worship of the Jews, and very much like the Roman Catholic cathedral of the present day, which, besides its high altar, has innumerable side-altars dedicated to its various saints and especially to the Virgin; and like the great temples of Babylon, which, besides the central Holy of Holies dedicated to the great god of the country, had innumerable other shrines consecrated to various other divinities, prominent among which was always the female half of the great god, the Beltis of the Bel—so until the time of Josiah the temple of Yahaweh at Jerusalem was a sort of pantheon where the shrines of numerous other divinities, but especially of Ashtaroth, were grouped about the Holy of Holies dedicated to Yahaweh. The high priest of the Yahaweh shrine of this great cathedral of Solomon was Zadok, and in his family the priesthood of Yahaweh became hereditary, and was ultimately limited to that family only.

The great national schism under Solomon's son found itself confronted, when it would have restored the ancient condition of things—for this was really the object of the rebels—with the religious influence of this Temple; and the new kingdom, in order to counteract that influence, was forced itself to establish cathedrals of a similar nature, to the detriment of the local shrines which were the representatives of the ancient religion, in the popular view at least. In the northern kingdom two cathedrals were established instead of one: the one at the ancient prehistoric shrine of Bethel, which was a place rendered peculiarly sacred to the Israelites through the stories of the patriarchs, and the other at Dan, one of those natural

centres of worship the sanctity of which continued unimpaired through the periods of many beliefs, because at that point the great springs of the Jordan gush out from the under world. The priesthood of the northern kingdom was apparently a restoration of somewhat more primitive times. They do not appear in the northern kingdom to have recognised the Levitical right to the same extent to which it was recognised in the south, but to have permitted persons of other tribes to officiate as well as Levites.

The priesthood of the Yahaweh Temple at Jerusalem was Aaronic. We are told incidentally that the priests of the cathedral at Dan were descended from Moses. If I understand the history of the north, the name Yahaweh did not receive the emphasis there which was given to it in the south. If the name was, in the earlier days of the northern kingdom, used at all, it apparently took a secondary place, the special name for God which was used being the broader and more generic title El.

At the time of Ahab, who made alliances of a very intimate nature with the Phoenicians in order to strengthen him in his contest with Damascus, Phoenician worship as such was introduced. It was in so many of its outward forms and names similar to the worship of Israel, that it may have seemed to Ahab as though it would be merely an adoption of something more complete and higher to substitute this worship for that of his own people. Jezebel, his wife, was, as we are led to suppose, an almost fanatical adherent of the national worship of her city. Her name itself means "woman of Bel," a name which has been handed down to us from the Phoenicians through the Spaniards in the form of Isabella. We see in other particulars the great influence which Jezebel exerted over her husband and over the court at large. It was the endeavour to substitute this apparently similar Phoenician cult for the native religion which brought about the fight against Baal headed by the prophet Elijah. His name (God is Yah) indicates the basis of the conflict. It is necessary that one characteristic Hebrew name

shall be taken for God, and he takes that name which has prevailed in the south and which is identified with the Temple at Jerusalem. His mission is to declare that God is Yah—or Yahaweh, as it appears in the full form. His mission was successful; and the Jehu dynasty, which was established in place of that of Ahab, is the Yahaweh dynasty. Jehu, as written in our Bible, is nothing but the word Yahaweh. It will be observed also that whereas until the time of Elijah we find in northern Israel no proper names containing the name Yah in composition, from that time on it begins to be as regular a component part of royal names as it had been in the southern kingdom since the days of David.

Athaliah, the daughter of Jezebel, becoming queen at Jerusalem during the minority of her son, usurped the throne for herself, and undertook to introduce Baal worship into Jerusalem also. The defeat of her project was due to the activity of the priests of the Temple of Yahaweh at Jerusalem; and the fact that these priests succeeded in preserving the Davidic dynasty from destruction and re-establishing it upon the throne, as well as the fact that they embodied national and popular sentiment in battling against Athaliah for the preservation of the cult of Yahaweh, naturally greatly increased their power.

The fall of Samaria is an event the literary and historical significance of which has generally been underestimated. Up to that time culture and civilisation had had their home in the north. The relative positions of Samaria and Judah were somewhat the same as those of Constantinople and Rome during the Middle Ages. The theologians of the West to-day claim that Rome represents the direct ecclesiastical line, the true Church, the true priesthood, whereas Constantinople represented a secondary development, and was guilty of heresy and schism. This is precisely the view which the writer of Chronicles takes with regard to the Church of Judah and the Church of Israel. But if in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the true Church and the genuine deposit of religion were at Rome, even the Roman Catholic historians must allow

that culture and civilisation were at Constantinople. It was the fall of Constantinople which drove this culture from the Eastern empire to the Western, brought about the Renaissance, and did its part, and that a great part, in effecting the religious reformation of the sixteenth century. Similarly the fall of Samaria resulted in sending the scholars and the literature and the civilisation of Samaria to Jerusalem, producing there the Renaissance of the time of Hezekiah, and preparing the way for the great religious reformation of the succeeding century under King Josiah. Hezekiah undertook to establish a library in Jerusalem (Prov. xxv. 1), and it is to this library presumably that we owe the preservation of so much of the literature of northern Israel, which is now embodied in our Bible. It was under Hezekiah that the prophets of Jerusalem first began to write and we encounter the written as over against the spoken prophecies. Presumably at the same time the earlier codifications of ritual and social laws began to assume a written form. There was discovered not long since at a temple in Crete a tablet containing directions for the sacrificers and worshippers at the temple. We were already familiar with the Phœnician tablet of Marseilles, containing a sort of tariff for the worshippers. I think we may fairly assume that long before the period of Hezekiah similar tablets and directions had been in existence for the convenience of the sacrificers and the benefit of the priests at Jerusalem. So, for example, the sacrificial provisions contained in the first chapters of Leviticus, which are of very ancient date, may well be supposed to have been handed down from an early period inscribed upon such tablets. But in the time of Hezekiah, I suppose, the codification of the laws and ritual and also of traditions and customs progressed much farther, under the stimulus of the literary atmosphere which then began to prevail.

I have already pointed out that this Renaissance led to a reform in the following century; indeed, the religious reformation had begun already at the time of Hezekiah, but was not completed and did not take its ultimate shape until the

succeeding century. At the time of Hezekiah, and still also at the time of Josiah, the Temple was, as has been said before, a Pantheon. A brazen serpent was worshipped there, the worship of which was justified by the story that during the wanderings in the wilderness it had been put up upon a pole at a time when poisonous serpents invaded the camp, and whosoever looked upon it had been healed. This is generally regarded by students of religions as a relic of totem worship. The Asherah was the symbol of a very foul cult, but that also, with all its disgusting surroundings and its lust, licensed under the name of religion, was housed in the courts of the Temple of Yahaweh at the time of Hezekiah. The religious reformation drove out all such impure worship and all foreign worship.

We find the prophet Isaiah denouncing mere ritual; we find him also a friend of and fellow-worker with the chief priest of the Temple of Yahaweh at Jerusalem. Isaiah's call to prophecy, according to his own account, was based on the ritual of the Temple. He receives the call through the form and in the language of that ritual as he is worshipping there. The sacred and mysterious Holy of Holies lies open before his eyes, and you see that in his thought God is localised there. That is the particular holy place through which he is able to conceive of the mystery, and the glory, and the holiness of God. Even that holiness doctrine which is so marked a characteristic of Isaiah is taken from the technical phraseology of the Jewish ritual. If the whole priesthood of the Temple was not awake to the spiritual meanings lying behind the ritual, at least the chief priest seems to have been, and a man so spiritually minded as Isaiah was able to find his religious home and his spiritual inspiration in the Temple of Jehovah. This being the case, we can see how it was that the reformation, which aimed at overthrowing the shrines of the false gods which were to be found in the Temple, originated with and was carried through chiefly by means of the priests of that Temple working in harmony with the prophets.

It is worth while to notice that the deliverance from

Sennacherib in this reign, connected as it was with the prophecies of Isaiah, played a most important part in directing and formulating the Messianic hope. In fact, the Messianic and prophetic interpretation of that deliverance became the cause of the downfall of good King Josiah in the following century. For, having this mighty deliverance before his eyes, due to the goodness and the reforms of Hezekiah, he supposed that he also, because of his reforms and because he had kept the Law of Yahaweh, would be given victory over superior numbers ; and relying on this faith, he ventured to oppose the overwhelming superior forces of the King of Egypt, and perished in the attempt.

Following Hezekiah came a period of reaction under Amon and Manasseh, and the introduction of various heathen cults, no longer apparently under the claim that they were national, but distinctly as foreign. The introduction of foreign cults of this nature naturally involved the interests of the priests even more than those of the prophets. The priests of Yahaweh's Temple were directly assailed by such attempts to establish other cults. It was during the reign of Josiah that the Book of Deuteronomy was found in the Temple—that book which claimed that the Temple of Yahaweh at Jerusalem was the only legitimate place of worship for Israelites, which laid down the law of unity of worship and prescribed this place as the God-ordained centre of the national religion. It will be observed that this was a revival of the ancient practice of the prehistoric, nomadic period of Israel's life, of sacrificing at one place, the one central shrine of the camp of the wandering Israelites ; and I have already pointed out that the study of the religious development of Israel seems to make it clear that unity of worship in this form originated with Moses as a ritual fact during the period when he was uniting the wandering tribes of Israel into one loose band of brothers. This ritual fact now assumes a new meaning ; it becomes a ritual necessity if the worship of one God is to be preserved ; and Deuteronomy is an attempt to call back the people by the prescription of one central place of worship to the

primitive Mosaic practice in this respect. Deuteronomy was properly and legitimately put forward as the Law of Moses. The reforms of Josiah which ensued upon the publication of Deuteronomy resulted in the permanent overthrow of all shrines to other gods and all the high places at which Yahaweh was worshipped, and in the centralisation of worship absolutely at the Temple of Yahaweh in Jerusalem. From this Temple also was banished every other shrine, the worship of Yahaweh alone being allowed there; and the ritual of the priesthood of the Temple of Yahaweh at Jerusalem was made the ritual of the nation. An attempt of a statesmanlike description was made to provide for the priests of Yahaweh who had been officiating at the various high places throughout the land. According to the Book of Deuteronomy, they were to be given places in the Temple at Jerusalem and put on an equality, upon complying with certain easy conditions, with the Aaronic priests of the Jerusalem Temple. It will be noticed that Jeremiah the prophet, himself of priestly origin, and the chief priest worked together in this reform. The opposition of the Aaronic priesthood of the Jerusalem Temple to the admission of the Levitical priests of the high places to equal privileges with themselves was, however, too strong to be overcome; and we shall see that in the succeeding century those Levitical priests who formerly officiated at the high places are relegated to a lower position, becoming Levites, as we generally understand that term.

Jeremiah's younger contemporary, Ezekiel, was also priest and prophet. From the reference which Jeremiah makes to the prophets at this period we are inclined to think that as a body their influence was not altogether for good. In the Exile prophets were burned by Nebuchadrezzar in the fire as those who were exciting the exiles to revolt. Compare also in Zechariah (xiii. 3 ff.) the reference to the bad repute of prophets at that time. It is fair to suppose that the conservatism of the priesthood needed to be combined with the radicalism of the prophetic spirit in order to produce prophets of the better type. At all events, both Jeremiah

and Ezekiel were at once priest and prophet. We have seen that Isaiah depended upon the ritual for the outward form of his inspiration. There is little or none of this in Jeremiah, but he, on the other hand, lays great stress on the Law. Ezekiel, however, is dependent for his symbolism and for his thought upon Jewish ritual to an extent many times exceeding the dependence of Isaiah. The symbolism of the Holy of Holies and the cherubim is the medium through which he receives his vision and his call to prophecy. But he also makes great use of the Law. His Utopia, as described in the last eleven chapters of his book, is an ideal Garden of Eden. He takes the story of the Garden of Eden, but makes his Eden on the pattern of priestly legislation and priestly ritual. Jerusalem is the centre of the universe, the Holy Land is the new Eden. There has been much controversy as to the relation of Ezekiel's Utopia to the priestly legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch, and it has been argued that that legislation was dependent upon Ezekiel's idea, and not his ideas dependent upon earlier legislation and practice. It seems to me that Ezekiel the priest did little more than take the theory of the Aaronic priests of the Jerusalem Temple, and, with a certain admixture of his own personal fancies, present a picture of the Holy Land administered upon that system. The legislation of the middle books seems to me, speaking roughly, to be a complete codification of the Aaronic idea as held by the priests of the Jerusalem Temple, of whom Ezekiel was one, rather than a development from Ezekiel's Utopia. The difference between this legislation and that of Deuteronomy is largely due to the fact that Deuteronomy represented a compromise, the attempt being made to bring the Levites into an equality with the Aaronic priests, which the latter, who regarded themselves as alone legitimate, refused to accept. They recognised the Levitical priests of the high places as descendants of the tribe of Levi, but had built up a theory in accordance with which the Levites in general were distinguished from the priests in particular; those who officiated in the Temple of Yahaweh at

Jerusalem being, according to this theory, the priests and the only priests. I suppose this theory received its complete formulation as the consequence of the struggle of which we have a record at the time of Josiah, but I do not suppose that it was an invention of Ezekiel; and what is true with regard to this question of the priesthood is, I think, true with regard to other matters of ritual in which we find a difference between the earlier codes or the Deuteronomic code and the final priest codes of the middle books.

During the Exile there was probably some theoretical development of older principles, or rather a definite codification and statement of theories which had not hitherto found definite expression in legislation, but on the whole the period of the Exile was a period of codification rather than creation. This is very distinctly marked in the matter of sacrifice. In general the animals which may be sacrificed are those domestic animals which are ordinary articles of food. Now the Hebrew codes (compare *Leviticus* i.) allowed the sacrifice of the bull, the sheep, the goat, and two varieties of doves. This represented the entire extent of the domestic animals used for food at the time when the laws of sacrifice took their definite form. But even in these laws we can see a development. The original law mentioned only the bull, the sheep, and the goat. The two varieties of doves are mentioned in a sort of codicil. This codicil belongs to the period when Israel, becoming a settled people, began to domesticate fowl. But why should we not have the cock mentioned as a sacrificial animal? The Jews came in contact with the cock first during the Captivity. The cock had not been introduced to the west before that as a domestic fowl; he was brought west with the Persian conquest. The Jews of to-day sacrifice the cock, and apparently this practice began with the period of the Exile; but the law of sacrifice was at the time of the Exile already so definitely completed that, although in popular practice the sacrifice was introduced, legally and officially no attention was paid to it, and there is no mention of it in the codes.

The priest code as such originated in the Jerusalem Temple. During and after the Exile the code of the Temple, popular traditions, and various other laws which had been handed down in various ways were worked up and combined into one whole, not without Babylonian influence. The collection of this material in one book of itself led to a certain amount of development. It lacked completeness. In one place the simple primitive statement was there, but the necessary deductions had not been drawn. In another place something was wanted to harmonise those things which conflicted. In another something was needed to define certain points—explanations possibly in the form of a story were needed. The work of bringing together all this material began during the Exilic period, and developed a scribal school among the Jews of the Exile, the business of which was to codify and unify tradition and law. Of creative action there was, in my judgment, comparatively little, and that little of the kind which I have described already. The priests, as a natural outcome of their history, as I have described it, furnished the scribes who did this work, and until the time of Ezra the priest we may regard this as the special line of development of the priesthood. The priests in Babylonia had become, through force of circumstances, interpreters of the oracles of God once more rather than sacrificers. Prophet and priest, soothsayer and interpreter of oracles had always stood side by side in the history of Israel, as in that of all the surrounding nations. I have already pointed out that from the time of Isaiah to the time of Ezra there was an inclination to unite the two functions in one person. That unity, however, was by no means complete, and we see from what we gather of the history of this period through its literature that from the time of the Exile onward, if priest and prophet did not diverge the one from the other, at least the two streams did not become one, but ran parallel until both were ultimately merged in the scribal school which became dominant after the time of Ezra.

The priestly school, as represented in the study and codification of the Law, became, after the Exile, distinctly particularistic.

Its object was to hedge Israel off from the nations among whom it was ; to find what was peculiar to Israel, and to lay the stress upon this. Some of the prophets of this period, on the other hand, carried out to a still further extent than the earlier prophets had done that universal conception of which we find so large an element in the prophecies of Amos and the first Isaiah. It is the second Isaiah who presents to us in this period the picture of Israel suffering for the salvation of all mankind. But the highest limit of the universal conception is reached in the post-Exilic Book of Jonah, which is a parable of the love of God towards the Gentiles equally with the Jews. With the adoption of the law under Ezra and Nehemiah the particularistic school may be said to have triumphed, but triumphed not at the expense of prophecy only, but also of the priesthood. Gradually, as a result of the dominance of the scribal theory, both priest and prophet were merged in the scribe. The Law took the place of both sacrifice and prophecy, and the entire thought of the nation was concentrated upon the interpretation of that Law and its application to the life of man. The sanctification of the ancient Law led in its turn to the sanctification of the ancient History, and the writings of the ancient Prophets, until the first canon of the Law was supplemented by the second canon of the Prophets, and that in course of time by the third canon, the Hagiographa ; and these three canons being established, the same methods of interpretation and enlargement by interpretation were applied to the Prophets and the Hagiographa which had been applied to the Law.

With the time of the Maccabees there comes a revival of prophecy in a new form, looking to the future only ; for the apocalyptic literature which was developed at that period, and at the head of which stands the Book of Daniel, was a true descendant of the ancient prophets. Prophetic in its nature also was the Messianic hope, which was re-created at this period ; but both the Messianic hope and the Book of Daniel are discussed in later chapters of this work.

CHAPTER VII

THE RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MESSIANIC HOPE

IT must be borne in mind that nowhere in the Old Testament is “Messiah” the technical term which it became in the post-Maccabæan, scribal period of Jewish history. In Leviticus it is applied to the High Priest; in the historical books to Saul, to David, to the patriarchs; in Lamentations to King Hezekiah; in Habakkuk to the people of Israel as a whole; in the Psalms to kings of the Davidic dynasty (and perhaps also to Israelitish kings) indiscriminately; in Deutero-Isaiah to Cyrus; and in the Book of Daniel both to Cyrus and to one of the Seleucids. This variety of use of the word in the Old Testament corresponds in some degree to the variety of simple motives ultimately combined in the grand, many-sided harmony of the Messianic hope realised. In general the word “Messiah” of the Hebrew text has been translated “anointed” in our Bible,¹ but in Daniel ix. 25, 26, where the word is used once in reference to Cyrus and once in reference to a Seleucid, the Hebrew “Messiah” is retained.

The Messianic passages of the Old Testament stand in no necessary connexion with the use of the word “Messiah.” Broadly speaking, those passages are Messianic which promise a delivery from present distress, either through the direct intervention of Yahaweh, the God and King of Israel, or through a Davidic sovereign (or David himself), the vicegerent of Yahaweh and the representative of His divinity upon earth,

¹ Corrected in the Canterbury Revision.

or through a human agent, outside of the Davidic dynasty, anointed by Yahaweh for that purpose; those passages are Messianic which foretell a millennial kingdom over which Yahaweh will reign either mediately or immediately, or which describe the preparation for this millennial kingdom through a Davidic sovereign, or through the people of Israel as specially appointed to that mission by Yahaweh; those passages are Messianic which describe the experiences of the ideally perfect "Servant of Yahaweh."

The prophetic concept of the relation of God, as Yahaweh, to Israel, inherited from Moses, was that of the direct government by God of His people. Moses did not unify the people into a nation, because of his conception of a theocratic empire. God must directly rule over His people. This concept was ideal, impracticable, as the history of Israel proves; but it contained a fruitful germ of heavenward progress, which was the divine essence of the Mosaic concept. After the practical needs of their situation had forced upon the Hebrews centralisation and regal authority, the prophets still adhered to this Mosaic concept, modified and further idealised by the new conditions. It is this which enables them steadfastly to look forward to the Messianic Kingdom of God's rule upon earth. But in order that a conception so ideal and exalted might be effective for the education and development of the people at large, it must operate upon lower and more worldly sentiments. The lower instrument through which it was to act was found in the royal form of government, or perhaps we might say in the person of one of the kings of Israel.

Anyone who has considered those Messianic passages which are concerned with a personal, human Messiah must, I think, have observed this phenomenon—that this phase of the Messianic hope emanates from the person of David. He is the great Messiah of God in the past to whom the people longingly look back. It is his glory, like the glory of the Roman Cæsar, which in each new age is reflected over his descendants. It is a return of the Davidic greatness which is looked for in the future. An idealised David is the

type of the royal human Messiah. In seeking a human basis for the Messianic hope we must begin here. This basis is one common to the Israelites with other people. It is that longing for the glory of the past, which is driven by the utter lack of its realisation in the present first into hope, and then into belief, in its restoration in the future. The British belief in the return of an Arthur, or the German hope of the reappearance of a Charlemagne or Frederick Barbarossa, were in origin the same as the Israelitish expectation of the second David, a longing for the glory of the past, metamorphosed through much meditation on its happiness in time of present distress into the hope of its restoration in the future.

Anyone who has studied, with any sort of appreciation, popular beliefs and myths and legends, realises that such a belief as this is neither quite literal nor altogether ideal. It connects itself literally with the name, the place, the family of David, and yet what it looks for is not David, but the kingdom and glory of David; so that at times it even seems ready, under peculiar circumstances, to loose its hold on the Davidic personality, and to look for the royal deliverer in a Cyrus or a Maccabæus. It is the popular mind, in distinction from the thoughtful leaders, to which the Davidic idea is most essential; which connects its hopes most closely with a literal descendant of David, in whom he shall be repersonified in all his ideal glory. Of course, this hope of a Davidic Messiah who shall restore the Davidic glory must result in the idealisation of its hero in the past as well as in the future, and hence we have the phenomenon of a double David in the Bible—the historical, actual David, and the mythical, ideal David. This idealisation the prophets make a fulcrum for their lever, their function being to lift the Messianic hope of a second kingdom of David into spiritual realms. The part which this Davidic hope played in moulding the history and character of the Jewish people and maintaining their nationality intact was enormous. The strength of that hope in Old Testament times is evidenced by psalmody and prophecy, and in a later age both by the apocalyptic literature which it called forth and

by the insurrections to which it gave rise. Even the hatred which the oppression, immorality, and idolatry of Solomon and his son aroused in the hearts of the Israelites of the northern kingdom did not quench the pride in David and his glory, so that Amos could say to them (ix. 11), "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old"; while Hosea, one of their number, prophesies (iii. 4, 5), "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek Yahaweh their God, and David their king; and shall fear Yahaweh and His goodness in the latter days."

Psychologically we are led to expect, from the origin and nature of this hope, that which we also find to be true regarding it—that it is most vividly pictured in the times of greatest distress. Passing over such passages as 2 Samuel vii. 16, where David is told, "Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee; thy throne shall be set up for ever," and the numerous similar passages in the Psalms concerning the glory and perpetuity of his kingdom, let us take up the still more minute and definite passages in the Prophets; as when Isaiah, crying out of the deepest humiliation of the kingdom of Judah, yet promises the people deliverance at the hand of a Davidic ruler, who shall restore a spiritualised kingdom of David. Such is that famous prophecy (ix. 1-7) which ends, "For increase of the government and for peace without end, upon David's throne, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to order it with judgment and with righteousness from henceforth and for ever. The zeal of Yahaweh Zebaoth will perform this"; or that prophecy which begins (xi. 1), "And there cometh forth a rod from Jesse's stem, and a Branch groweth from his roots." Micah sees in the sore misery of Jerusalem the deep darkness that heralds the glorious morn. The woes of Judah are the birth-pangs

of the Messiah. The nation sinks so low that she is even led forth out of Jerusalem ; but this exile is the pangs of travail with the glorious future. The capital may be lost ; “but thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto Me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings out have been from of old, from everlasting” ; which is distinctively Davidic prophecy, although by a poetic device the name of David is not mentioned. The rise of a better king, Hezekiah, renders Isaiah’s later Messianic prophecies less definite and personal, and he even seems half ready to accept Hezekiah himself as the restorer of the Davidic kingdom. Again, under a bad king, in times of great distress, Jeremiah (xxiii. 5) foretells a righteous branch to David, and (xxx. 9) that the people freed from bondage shall serve “David their king.” In the time of the Exile Ezekiel is almost prosaic in the literalness with which he uses the Davidic personality, as where he says (xxxiv. 23), “And I will set over them one shepherd, and he shall herd them, even My servant David ; he shall herd them, and he shall be to them a shepherd” ; or (xxxvii. 24, 25), “And My servant David king over them ; for one shepherd shall be for them all : and in My religion shall they walk, and My statutes shall they hear and do them ; and they shall dwell in the land which I gave to My servant, to Jacob, in which their fathers dwelt ; yea they shall dwell in it, they and their sons, and their sons’ sons, for ever, and David My servant prince over them for ever.”

After the Exile Haggai sees in Zerubbabel, as the descendant of David, him who is to fulfil the hope of a Davidic restoration, and the book of his prophecies closes with a distinct expression of that view (ii. 23) ; “In that day, saith Yahaweh Zebaoth, will I take thee Zerubbabel, son of Shealtiel, My servant, saith Yahaweh, and will make thee as a signet, for thee I have chosen, saith Yahaweh Zebaoth.” Zechariah seems at first to entertain the same hope (iv. 7 ff.), but Zerubbabel is not the man to restore Davidic glory ; he can only shine in the borrowed lustre of his ancestors. Then

Joshua, the High Priest, is declared to be the Branch (vi. 12), and you have the same combination of priest and king in the Messianic concept, which appears in Psalm cx. Joshua, the Branch, is placed upon a theocratic throne (vi. 13). It is the failure of the worthless successors of David to fulfil the expectation of the people which causes the Davidic element to vanish for a time, supplanted by the priestly.

It must not be supposed, however, that the people altogether abandoned their idea of a Davidic restoration. Events show that it still lingered on. The history of the people to the time of the Maccabæan revolt is one of insignificance and failure, but not oppression, and we find, accordingly, no vivid expression of the expectation of a personal, Davidic Messiah. The line of David has sunk into obscurity and oblivion. Malachi speaks only of a millennial kingdom, and of Elijah as the herald of its coming. After the story of the assumption of Elijah into heaven (2 Kings ii. 11) it seemed a moral certainty that a belief in his return would spring up. The Book of Malachi contains the first definite expression of this belief, which plays so important a part in the Christological scheme of the Pharisees. The Seleucid oppression and the Maccabæan revolt again fanned into a flame the smouldering fires of the Messianic hope in the restoration of national greatness, as is proven as well from the history of the period as from the Book of Daniel. The lack of a prominent representative or descendant of David prevents the author of Daniel from representing the new kingdom as Davidic. It is pictured as an earthly rule of Yahaweh through an undesignated, semi-divine hero, under whom the saints shall possess the earth. The popular mind, finding Judas Maccabæus to be a hero, seems to have been inclined to see in him and his house, despite non-Davidic origin, the returned David. But this delusion soon passed away, and the apocalyptic literature of the immediately following period shows us the Davidic hope stronger and more definite than ever before. The Psalter of Solomon, for example, gives us an excellent idea of the way in which the temporary belief in the Asmonæan dynasty

served, after the delusion was realised, to revive and strengthen the Davidic hope ; and from this period until Kokba and the final revolt against Hadrian the air was full of the expectation of the Messiah of David's line.

I have thus endeavoured to describe the rise of the hope of a Davidic Messiah—that is, of a ruler of David's line who should restore the glory of the idealised kingdom of David—and to point out that in its origin this hope was one common to Israel with other nations—a hope conceived by desire, and born of adversity. This hope I have briefly sought to trace through the uncertain stages of its incipiency until it assumed fixed form in the latter days of the Asmonæan dynasty.

This is the popular element which constitutes the warp of the ultimate, realised hope. The woof which was woven into this warp was the grand teaching that Yahaweh Himself is King of Israel, and Israel His chosen, His anointed. The rule of an earthly king is possible only on the theory that he is the representative and vicegerent of Yahaweh, the embodiment of His righteousness on earth. Notwithstanding the unrighteousness of each successive Davidic sovereign, the perfect, unhistorical David of their ideal enables the prophets to look forward to an ultimate righteous king of David's line, the true representative of Divinity on earth, under whom and in whom is realised the ideal Israel.

Anyone reading carefully the vision of Isaiah (vi.), the record of his call to prophecy, must see how deeply the prophet was impressed with a sense of his people's wickedness. Yahaweh, the pure and righteous Divinity, cannot accept the people in its present condition, and yet it is utterly impossible that He should destroy or abandon His people ; therefore He will purge them with a great calamity, "until the cities are desolate without inhabitant, and the houses without man, and the field lieth waste," until it seems as though no remnant could escape ; but "as the terebinth and oak when cut down grow again from the stock that remains in the ground, so shall Israel grow again, for a holy seed shall be its stock." Here stands out clearly the doctrine of the identi-

fication of Yahaweh with Israel, so that He cannot forsake nor destroy His people, and, on the other hand, as a necessary correlative, the doctrine of the perfect essence of the people of Israel, which is purified from the dross of common and unrighteous Israel by the fire of affliction. In Joel and Zephaniah, in some of the Psalms, and here and there in Isaiah and the other prophets, the Davidic king is ignored and, in Mosaic manner, Yahaweh is represented as the direct ruler of the millennial kingdom. On the other side, the doctrine of the perfect essence leads to the doctrine of the "Servant of Yahaweh" in Deutero-Isaiah and some of the Psalms. The teaching that Yahaweh is King of Israel, and that Israel is His chosen people, is developed, therefore, in two directions; and with the fundamental belief in the restoration of David's glory we must combine the doctrine of Yahaweh's immediate action in the millennial kingdom, and the teaching of the perfect essence suffering for the imperfect people at large. Such doctrines they were which, woven together by scribal study, produced the systematic, but apparently inconsistent Christology of the Pharisees.

Between the utterance of the Messianic prophecies and the ministry of Jesus there intervened a period which had a very considerable part to play in the preparation for the Messiah. In the first place, it was sufficiently long to allow the varied conceptions of the prophets to crystallise into dogma and acquire an undisputed claim to validity as inspired utterances. The change of language was also a factor in this process, putting the ancient writings under seal, as it were. In the second place, the full execution of the Law of Moses during this period united the people among themselves, and secured them from external interference during the process of dogmatisation; further, it removed sacrifice altogether out of the sphere of the common life of the people, idealising and refining it. The festal side of sacrifice was suppressed, and the expiatory notion emphasised. The Law laid great stress on the sinfulness of the people and the necessity of making atonement for sin, and post-legal developments emphasised

this even more strongly. But while one tendency of this period was to impress upon the people their sinfulness and the necessity of expiation, at the same time the expiatory sacrifice was removed out of the popular sphere, idealised, and surrounded with a mystic halo of awe and glory. On another side the exaltation of the Law led to the synagogical system, with its development of personal religion. In the third place, during this period was developed the Pharisaic and popular doctrine of the resurrection of the body. Not to attempt too many details of the preparation of this period, the external history also played its part. The partially successful revolt of the Maccabees revived the national pride of the Jews and confirmed their belief in Yahaweh's special favour. That revolt quickened the Messianic hope, and the deep and ever-increasing humiliation of the Roman epoch, following the nation's brief dream of glory, brought it to birth. From about the time of Jesus until the time of Kokba, the nation was in a condition of unrest, hourly expecting what the rabbins called "the birth-pangs of the Messiah."

Our knowledge of what Jews of Jesus' time expected the Messiah to be is derived from Jewish apocalyptic literature, the Targums, the Talmud, and the New Testament. The Targums give us what we may call official knowledge of those Old Testament passages which were universally held to be Messianic, and were constantly read as such in the synagogues. The date of the Targums is uncertain. Jewish tradition refers the oldest of them to the first century, but critics seem to have discredited this tradition. It is, however, allowed that at the time of Jesus a Targum, or popular and explanatory translation of a large part or the whole of the Old Testament, was in use. Whether it had already assumed written form, or was merely handed down by oral tradition, is uncertain. For all our purposes the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan may be regarded as identical with the Targum of the time of Jesus; for whatever changes, if any, were made in the Messianic passages would have told against and not in favour of the Christian view. Reckoning our Messianic passages, then, according to

the Targum, we find represented the three Messianic conceptions mentioned above. The Messiah of the tribe of Judah and family of David is the most fully represented of all. In the Targum of Onkelos (Gen. xlix. 10) we read, instead of "until Shiloh come," "until the Messiah come, whose is the kingdom." In Numbers xxiv. 17, in the prophecy of Balaam, "the sceptre out of Israel" becomes "the Messiah out of Israel." The Targum of Jonathan makes Micah say (v. 2) with reference to Bethlehem Ephratah, "From thee before Me shall arise the Messiah, who shall be the bearer of power over Israel, whose name was spoken from old time, from days of everlasting." In Isaiah xi. 1 "the rod out of the stem of Jesse, the Branch out of his roots" is explained as "the king, the Messiah." In Jeremiah xxiii. 5 "the righteous Branch of David" is "the Messiah of righteousness" whom God will raise up unto David. Of passages of the second class, those which represent God as an immediate deliverer, Habakkuk iii. 18 may serve as an example. In the original we read, "And I, in Yahaweh will I rejoice; I will exult in the God of my salvation." In explanation of this the Targum of Jonathan has, "On account of the wonder and salvation which Thou hast wrought for Thy Messiah and for the remnant of Thy people which is left, said the prophet: and I, in the word of Yahaweh will I rejoice, and I will exult in God, the worker of my salvation." The third class, which represents the Messiah as the perfect essence suffering for the imperfect people at large, is also recognised in the Targum. The "Servant of Yahaweh" of Deutero-Isaiah is explained as the Messiah in the Targum of Jonathan. Accordingly that famous passage (lii. 13-liii. 12) was in the time of Jesus authoritatively explained to the people as Messianic. Those parts of this passage, however, which represent Messiah as making an atonement were, at least in part, explained away. "Surely our griefs He bore, and our pains He carried them" (liii. 4) becomes in the Targum "For our debts will He pray, and our misdeeds for His sake shall be forgiven." "All of us like sheep have gone astray, each after his own way have we turned, and Yahaweh hath laid on

Him the iniquity of us all" (v. 6) is rendered "It was the good pleasure (of Yahaweh) to forgive the sins of us all for His sake." Weber,¹ commenting on this passage, says, "Everywhere, even in the last verse ('He bare the sin of many, and for the transgressors made He intercession'), the Targum finds no representative suffering and death of the Messiah to expiate the sins of the people."

I use the Targum on the last cited passages merely to establish the fact that at the time of Jesus such passages, which represent the ideally perfect "Servant of Yahaweh" as making atonement for imperfect, sinful Israel, were interpreted as Messianic, not to show that the Jews accepted the doctrine of the Messiah as making atonement by suffering and death. Whatever part, however, tradition might play among the Jews, it always rested ultimately on Scripture, rendering possible an appeal to the latter against itself. The Targumic explanation of these passages as Messianic gave authority for their application in the case of Jesus, while against the non-expiatory interpretation put upon them in the Targum it was quite in order to make appeal to the original Scripture. The position of tradition, as over against the Scriptures, at the time of Jesus was much the same as at the Reformation.

The early apocalyptic literature, such as the Psalter of Solomon, part of the Book of Enoch, and part of the Sibylline prophecies, is a valuable witness against a few writers who have imagined the Messianic hope to have been dead at the time of Jesus, and have tried to represent the testimony of the Gospels to an existing Messianic expectation as fanciful and false, and Talmudic doctrine and post-Christian revolt and turbulence among the Jews as alike a side product of Christianity.

The Talmud and New Testament must be studied together. By combining incidental allusions in the New Testament with passages of the Talmud a pretty fair picture may be painted of Jewish belief and expectation at the time of Jesus. It

¹ *Altsynagog. Theol.*, p. 345.

is impossible to date in any way such a heterogeneous mass of speculation and tradition as the Talmud. Some of it is very old, some not. In some cases the kernel of a tradition may be old, while the tradition in the form given in the Talmud is comparatively new. The New Testament serves in some sort as a measuring-scale to the Talmud, and by a comparison of the two some valuable results are obtained.

Comparing, then, the Talmud and the New Testament, we find a great resemblance as to principle in their method of using the Prophets. New Testament writers frequently tell us that this thing or that thing was done "that it might be fulfilled which was written," or "said." The Haggada uses the same phrase repeatedly, telling this or that trivial story, it may be, to illustrate the fulfilment of various prophecies. The principle in both cases is that each word of prophecy must find its fulfilment. The New Testament claim that Moses and all the prophets testified concerning Jesus is the Talmudic doctrine that all the Prophets testified only of the days of the Messiah. The Talmudic idea that all events, destinies, hopes, and wishes which connect themselves with the Holy Land or its inhabitants have been already announced by the Prophets and may be found by the exercise of sufficient ingenuity, is manifestly at the bottom of some New Testament references to the Old Testament (such as Matt. ii. 23). But besides these agreements of principle, there is also agreement as to certain points of detail regarding the Messiah. Edersheim, in *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, p. 164, mentions the following doctrines concerning the Messiah as supported by the Talmud: "Premundane existence, elevation above Moses and the angels, representative character, sufferings, violent death for his people,¹ work on behalf of living, redemption and restoration of Israel." These can all be supported from the Talmud, and yet it can hardly be said, I

¹ This may be a later development consequent upon the death of Kokba, whom Rabbi Akiba had formally declared to be the Messiah, and it may have been in the same connexion that the idea arose of a suffering Messiah of the tribe of Ephraim.

think, that all of them are really taught there. The great popular belief at the time of Jesus, as we gather from a comparison of New Testament and Talmud, was in a conquering, human, but almost superhuman king of David's line. Preceding him would come Elijah to preach a great repentance ; perhaps, also, Moses and Jeremiah, or yet others of the prophets.

Having discussed the Jewish hope of a Messiah, it remains to make a few suggestions regarding the bearing of what has been presented on some parts of the New Testament. In considering the statements of New Testament writers with reference to Old Testament prophecies, we must recognise two opposite possibilities : of inventing or colouring facts to make the actuality correspond with prediction ; of perverting or altering a prophecy to show that the event had been predicted. The first possibility must be considered in those cases where we learn from the New Testament itself or from other sources that a strong expectation existed, that is, in the test points of the Messiahship as conceived by the Jews. The Davidic descent is one of these points. Was the Davidic descent of Jesus invented, consciously or unconsciously, in order to connect Him with the Messianic predictions ? The genealogies given in St. Matthew and St. Luke go for little with the critics in answering this question. It is the incidental passages in the Gospels which are strong. They seem to show, without doubt, that He was admitted by all, His enemies included, to be a descendant of David through Joseph. There is no sign in the whole body of New Testament literature, nor, so far as I am aware, in Talmudic literature, that this claim was seriously contested. We know, moreover, that the family of David was not extinct even a century after Jesus, so that the possibility of testing the claim existed. Under these circumstances the existence of the expectation is not evidence against the fact.

A minor question, a side issue of the Davidic descent, is the birth in Bethlehem. Here the decision is not so absolute. Leaving aside the story of the birth as given in

St. Matthew and St. Luke, there is no further notice of any connexion which Jesus had with Bethlehem. He is, on the contrary, constantly referred to as coming from Nazareth, and that in cases where His birth in Bethlehem, had it been known, ought certainly, we should think, to have been mentioned. So His Nazarene origin was objected to His Messianic claims, and we do not learn that the objection was answered. On the other hand, it is claimed, there are peculiarities in the account of the birth in Bethlehem which render it improbable that it was invented to satisfy the terms of prophecy. It tends to dishonour, so far as its main fact goes, and not to honour. It is too accurate and circumstantial. The argument from Jewish expectation may work here in two ways. Primarily it militates against the fact. If the fact that Jesus was the Messiah be first firmly established, a secondary favourable argument may be constructed. In following the development of the Messianic hope, we find the expectation of the restoration of the Davidic kingdom the fulcrum on which the prophets rest their lever in lifting up and spiritualising the conceptions of the people and preparing them for the divine revelation. It is, then, scarcely conceivable that when God makes that revelation He should throw aside all that had been accomplished by the prophets, by failing to build on the foundation which had been so long and carefully prepared. It was, in point of fact, impossible to make a firm attachment to the Messianic hopes of Israel without Davidic birth. With reference to this secondary argument it must, however, be observed that its chief strength applies to the fact of Davidic birth, and that it is not strong with reference to such a side issue as the birth in Bethlehem, until it be first proven that that is a necessary part of the Davidic concept.

The question regarding the position of John the Baptist may be referred to this category, inasmuch as the expectation of his coming formed an important introductory part of the Messianic hope. The testimony of Josephus, compared with that of the New Testament, gives in this case indubitable proof of the historical character of the Baptist and his work.

His activity, as represented from both sources, was such as fully to justify Jesus in pointing to him, as He is reported to have done, as fulfilling the expectation comprehended under the name Elijah, and, therefore, as an additional proof of His own Messiahship. The question as to John's views regarding both his own mission and the Messiah is more difficult to answer. In view of the whole condition of Messianic belief in his time, it seems impossible to hold that he expected an immediate revelation of Yahaweh rather than a revelation through a personal Messiah. He must be attached to the thought of his own time, not torn out of his connexion and attached to a certain line of thought in the past. In face of any direct and modified evidence to the contrary, it must be assumed that his thought was moulded and modified by the thought and conditions of his time, and hence, in relation to the Messianic hope, that he looked for a personal Messiah. There is no reason, furthermore, to discredit the story of the three synoptical Gospels, that John sent to inquire of Jesus whether He were the Messiah. This would point to a position of friendliness towards Him, with an inclination, perhaps, to regard Him as the Messiah, and yet an uncertainty as to whether He were really so. The synoptical account of the baptism of Jesus does not, so far as the Baptist is concerned, conflict with this view. As to himself, his attitude, as there related, shows both his greatness and his littleness. He was certain of a divine mission to prepare the way of the Messiah by preaching repentance; on the other hand, he is not conscious of being literally Elijah. Bound by the letter, he is unable to spiritualise the conception of the return of Elijah, as Jesus did; hence he attached himself to another passage of Scripture, where Isaiah speaks of the voice crying in the wilderness (the very passage which Malachi had developed into his prophecy of the coming of Elijah).

The expectation that the Messiah would show signs and work wonders cannot reasonably be supposed to have given rise to all the stories of the miracles of Jesus, and need not be further discussed here.

The virgin birth of Jesus and His resurrection from the dead belong to the second category. The birth of the Messiah from a virgin was no part of the Messianic conception of the Jews. If we find such a belief existing with reference to Jesus, we cannot, therefore, suppose that it was a reflex of the Messianic expectation, since that expectation involved nothing of the sort. The prophetic passage by which the virgin birth is substantiated in the New Testament is nowhere explained as Messianic, and the form in which it is quoted is found neither in the Hebrew text nor in the Targum.¹ As far as it goes this is, then, an argument in favour of the fact. Without entering into the question of fact, it may be said that the argument against it from silence being a very strong one, makes it advisable that apologists should avoid involving this question with the question of the Incarnation, basing the latter upon the virgin birth. In this St. Paul can be quoted as an example.

The story of the resurrection from the dead, like the story of the divine conception, cannot be derived from the Jewish expectation of the Messiah. Jesus seems to have told His disciples that the Scriptures prophesied His death and resurrection,² but it requires considerable ingenuity to pick out and piece together Scripture texts which may be thought to prove such a death and resurrection from the dead. Certainly it constituted no part of the Jewish doctrine or expectation regarding the Messiah, as is abundantly proved by the concurrent testimony of the Talmud and the New Testament. This is in so far an argument for the fact. There is in this case no argument of silence against the fact. It was the corner-stone of St. Paul's preaching, as proved by his unim-

¹ See Appendix, p. 317.

² They even said His resurrection on the third day, with which compare a rabbinic comment of uncertain date on Hosea vi. 2, quoted by WÜNSCHE, *Beiträge*, p. 197, "All inhabitants of the earth must taste of death, but God will renew them on the third day, *i.e.* restore them to life and set them before Him."

peached letters, within twenty-five years of the event. It is narrated in all the Gospels. It is repeatedly mentioned or referred to by the other New Testament writers.

It may not be amiss to add a few words regarding the attitude which Jesus assumed towards the Messiahship, and regarding the citation of the Old Testament in the New for the purpose of showing that Jesus was the fulfilment in detail of Messianic prophecies. As to the latter point, I apprehend that there is a by no means contemptible argument for the propriety of the use, within reasonable limits, of such citation of the Old Testament for details of the life of Jesus, and also that Jesus is the fulfilment of such predictions. The use of the Old Testament in the New must be studied in connexion with the theological development and thought of the period. Such and such passages were at that time regarded as Messianic. Would it not be reasonable that God should cause His Messiah to fulfil, to some extent at least, these expectations of the Jews? and was it not even necessary to do so in order to attach Him to the thought of the times? If such a course was reasonable and necessary, it may afford some clue to the use which Jesus Himself makes of certain Old Testament passages.

As to the former matter. Until the very end of His life Jesus asserted His Messiahship only to a trusted few, strictly forbidding them to publish it. Towards the people He maintained an attitude of reserve. While by many of His acts tacitly claiming the Messiahship, He yet did not at first formally and publicly proclaim Himself the Messiah. Indeed, He could not have done so without exciting a revolt or causing His own premature death. This position enabled Him to establish a Messianic record, and to prepare His disciples for the work of proclaiming Him as the true Messiah on the ground of that record. When He did at last openly proclaim Himself to be the Messiah, which He did very clearly—first by deeds and then in words—it was so done that a revolt was avoided, and His death ensued in a manner according with the Old Testament prophecies authoritatively

set forth as Messianic. The object of His course in these particulars seems to have been to enable His followers to preach Him as the true Messiah on the ground of the record which He made.

Studying the life and teaching of Jesus in connexion with the life and thought of His times, we find Him attaching Himself thoroughly to that life and thought, and, at the same time, we find Him revolutionising them—revolutionising them, however, to some extent in the same way in which the Reformers revolutionised their times, namely, by going back to that which was more primitive. Through and over the teachings and traditions of the rabbins and the peculiarly Jewish conception of His compeers, He appeals to the prophets. The intervening period had done its work of preparation, and must now be carried back to union with the past. Jesus is the manifestation of Yahaweh. He is the ideal Israel; or, more catholic than prophecy in His fulfilment of its concept, He is ideal humanity, the heaven-throned apex of that pyramid whose base is mankind at large and its middle point the church of the saints. The careful preparation for the manifestation of a Messiah, the gradual elevation of a common human longing to a glorious aspiration, the fulfilment of which could be found only in some manifestation of the Deity, seems to argue most strongly a Divine purpose, and to confirm our belief that He whose life both fulfilled and elevated that aspiration was Messiah and was Divine. Jesus, if His claims be allowed, was Messiah in this threefold manner—the human descendant of David; ideally perfect humanity suffering for the imperfect; the Divinity manifested. The first and lowest of these was an instrumentality for the revelation of the other two. The belief in the Davidic sovereign played the important part it did, in order that there might be a point of attachment to the natural human longing of the people, to lift their thoughts and hopes to a higher truth.

PART III
THE BOOK OF PSALMS

CHAPTER VIII

THE GROWTH OF THE JEWISH PSALTER

OLD Testament criticism has established by analysis of the Law, the Prophets, and those historical documents which have come down to us, the fact of a growth or evolution in the religion of Israel. An attempt is now being made to determine the relation of the Psalter to this religious evolution, and thus to fix the dates both of the Psalter and of the individual psalms which compose it.

The Psalter was, admittedly, a church hymnal. Now it is certainly true of the hymns contained in modern collections of hymns for Church use that few or none of those more than a century old are sung as they issued from the author's hand. The more popular a hymn, moreover, the more liable it is to change, and the great hymns of the Church have been gradually moulded into their present shape by a long process of manipulation. In fact, an excellent introduction to the study of the Psalter is the *Te Deum*. An ancient hymn of uncertain origin and gradual growth, in later ages confidently ascribed to those famous fathers of the Church, Ambrose and Augustine, and to a particular occasion in the life of the latter, it has a history instructively parallel to that of more than one of the Psalms of David. We may lay it down as a principle universally applicable in criticism of hymns and songs long in popular use, that they change and grow in the mouth of the people. If this is true of the West, even down to our own time, much more was it true of the days of primitive antiquity, and among the Oriental Hebrews, careless

as we know them to have been, until a comparatively late date, about any text but that of the Law.

We are not confined to an argument from principle and analogy. There are not a few psalms in which both change and growth are patent to the most casual observer. Such are Psalms ix. and x., which together originally constituted an alphabetic acrostic, every second verse commencing with a different letter in the order of the alphabet. Of the original poem, so easily traceable owing to this alphabetic arrangement, the first eighteen verses of the ninth and the last seven verses of the tenth Psalm, representing the first ten (*D* has dropped out) and the last four letters of the alphabet, are preserved almost unchanged. But instead of sixteen intervening verses, representing the other eight letters of the Hebrew alphabet, we now have thirteen verses entirely without acrostic arrangement. In other words, for some reason, this originally alphabetic psalm was afterwards modified by the removal of more than a third of the original number of verses and the substitution of others, in which no attempt was made to preserve the alphabetically acrostic arrangement. Moreover, the inserted verses (which, by the way, present a corrupt and ill-preserved text in striking contrast to the rest of the psalm) are quite opposite in tone to the original portion. This is hopeful and almost triumphant, while the newer part is mournful and complaining.

Another example of the addition of mournful verses to a joyful hymn is furnished in Psalm xliv. Here the first eight verses, closed with a *Selah* in the Hebrew, constitute an original triumph-song, to which a later poet added a much longer dirge of lamentation. This method of growth, by addition at the end rather than insertion in the middle, is naturally the more common. Still another example is Psalms xlii. and xlili. These two are one psalm, consisting of three strophes, each strophe closing with the same refrain. The last strophe is of later origin than the others, and was composed upon the second strophe as a basis. Similarly in Psalm iv. the last four verses are a later composition, made

up of citations from or allusions to other writings, after the manner of Psalm lxxxvi. It can be shown that Psalms iii., xlvi., lxxx., and not a few others, have grown in a similar way by the addition of new stanzas, sometimes as long as the original poem, or longer. In other cases two or more separate psalms have been welded into one, as in xix., xl., and lxxvii. This seems to have been a common method of composition in the later period. An excellent example of its use is furnished in 1 Chronicles xvi., where a psalm of David is composed, as if on purpose for our instruction, out of Psalms cv., xcvi., and cvi. Similarly Psalm cviii. was composed out of Psalms lvii. and lx.

There are also a few psalms in which we can show the composition of a longer liturgical hymn, or part of a hymn, for a more ancient, shorter liturgical formula as a theme or motive. Psalm lxviii., in its original form, was composed on the theme of the ancient formulae of the ark contained in Numbers x. 35, 36. Psalm cxviii. is founded on the ancient sacrificial chant: "Give thanks to Yahaweh Zebaoth, for Yahaweh is good, for His mercy endureth for ever" (Jer. xxxiii. 11). Psalms cvi. and cvii. make free use of the same theme; Psalm cxxxvi. reborrows it from cxviii. and develops it still further. More common is the addition of a refrain to mark the close of a stanza musically, the insertion of single verses of an explanatory or parenthetical character, or the addition of what might be called a postscript at the end of a psalm. A good example of the addition of a refrain may be found in Psalm xlvi., or still better in Psalm xlvi., where it is rendered more apparent by the fact that the refrain (*vv. 7 and 11*) is Yahawistic, while the psalm is Elohistic. In Psalm xlvi. a later Yahawistic recension is evidently responsible for the insertion of verse 8, which destroys the symmetry of the strophes and interrupts the movement of thought. Verses 20 and 21 of Psalm li. may be taken as a specimen of the postscript. The object of these verses, according to nearly all the critics, was to give a sacrificial character to an anti-sacrificial psalm. Their relation to the remainder of the psalm in regard of

their content may be compared with the relation of the speech of Elihu (chaps. xxxii.-xxxvii.) to the remainder of the Book of Job. In several cases these postscripts are marked by the use of Adonai (Lord), where the psalm itself has consistently employed either Yahaweh (LORD), or Elohim (God). This would seem to indicate an Adonistic recension of the Psalter, or some parts of it. Such an Adonistic postscript has been added, for example, at the close of the already composite Psalm xliv.

This brief statement gives a very inadequate view of the amount and nature of the changes which have taken place in the growth of individual psalms and which render necessary the greatest caution in any attempt to date them by their contents.

Again, if the Psalter was the hymn-book of the Jewish Church, it follows from all analogies that it represents largely the popular side of religion. Now the spiritual leaders are in advance of the people, and even after they are canonised the general belief of the Church still lags behind them. Moreover, popular belief, or the belief of the Church at large, is inconsistent. It accepts the prophets on the one side, and inherited forms and even superstitions on the other; subscribes to the one, and practises in large measure the other. The popular belief of the Church can never be measured by the strict canons of the theologians. So it comes to pass that people will profess orthodoxy in their creeds and sing heresy in their favourite hymns with the most naïve unconsciousness of any inconsistency between them. All this must be carefully taken into account in a critical study of the Psalter. I do not mean to deny that there are not a few psalms which are quite abreast of the thought of the spiritual leaders, having, indeed, been composed by them. I also recognise the fact that the whole Psalter received a certain priestly tinge or bias from its use in the Temple, and that a considerable portion of the last two books was actually composed in the Temple itself, or under the immediate influence of the Temple service. But, as a whole, the Psalter represents, like all hymnals, what we may roughly call the popular theology, inconsistent and un-

theological, if I may be permitted the paradox, not to be compared too closely with the ritual of the priests, the canons of the lawgiver, or the sermons of the prophet.

The Psalter, as we have it, is divided into five books, as follows: i.-xli., xlii.-lxxii., lxxiii.-lxxxix., xc.-cvi., cvii.-cl. This division is indicated in the text by the directions, "second book," "third book," etc. Each book, except the last, is also provided with a doxology. Thus verse 13 of Psalm xli. reads:—

"Blessed be Yahaweh, God of Israel,
From everlasting to everlasting.
Amen and amen."

In Psalm lxxii., verses 18 and 19 constitute the doxology; in Psalm lxxxix., verse 52; in Psalm cvi., verse 48. At the end of the fifth book there is no separate doxology; but Psalm cl. is ordinarily regarded as taking its place, both for that book and also for the whole collection.

This division into five books is found in the Septuagint Greek translation as well as in the Hebrew original; this would seem to show that the division existed before this translation was made—probably some time in the second century B.C. This fivefold division makes the Psalter singularly symmetrical with the five books of the Law; it is generally supposed to have been made for that express purpose, as it is an artificial division—at least in part—and clearly not original. An examination of the Psalms themselves shows us an earlier division into three books instead of five. The division between Psalms cvi. and cvii. corresponds to no natural division in the Psalter. Beginning with Psalm ciii., we have a series of five psalms dealing with the wonderful works of God in creation and in the history of Israel, evidently placed together because of their contents. Especially is this true of Psalms cv., cvi., and cvii., which all begin with the same formula, "O give thanks unto Yahaweh!" Moreover, while Psalm ciii. bears the heading, "A Psalm of David," and cvii. the similar heading, "A Song, a Psalm of David," Psalms civ.-cvii. have no headings. The heading of Psalm ciii.

belongs to Psalms ciii.—cvii. as constituting one piece. They formed a whole by themselves, and the division was made after they had been collected into one. This shows that Psalms xc.—cl., or a portion of those psalms in which both cvi. and cviii. were included, once formed one collection or book of psalms, which was later divided into two parts, and a doxology inserted after Psalm cvi. to mark the division. The division itself was probably made in order to raise the number of books to five, after the analogy of the Pentateuch. But why divide at precisely this point? The reason seems to me not hard to find. The first three books of the Psalter had already been divided as at present, and the last of those books happened to contain seventeen psalms. The same number was counted off from the last collection to constitute Book iv., and so it chanced that the division fell thus inappropriately between Psalms cvi. and cvii., which properly belong to one and the same series.

The division between Psalms lxxii. and lxxiii., while older than that between cvi. and cvii., is itself not original. Between Psalms xli. and xlii., on the other hand, there is a natural and original division; for, in the psalms of the first book, Yahaweh is regularly used as the name of God; but in the second, Elohim. Analysing the contents of the second and third books according to the headings, we find Psalms xlii.—xlix. ascribed to the "Sons of Korah"; Psalm 1. is a "Psalm of Asaph"; Psalms li.—lxxii. form a collection described by a colophon attached to the end of Psalm lxxii., as the "Prayers of David, son of Jesse." Psalms lxxiii.—lxxxiii., like Psalm 1., are described as Psalms of Asaph. All of these psalms up to this point are characterised by the use of Elohim as the name of the Deity. Then follow six psalms of a composite nature, in which the name Yahaweh is used. Of these, Psalms lxxxiv., lxxxv., lxxxvii., and lxxxviii. are ascribed to the sons of Korah, lxxxviii. being also ascribed by a second heading to Heman the Ezrahite; Psalm lxxxix. is ascribed to Ethan the Ezrahite; and Psalm lxxxvi. is described as a "Hymn of David."

Evidently there is some confusion and a good deal of editing in these two books, which, it is safe to say, were originally one. We have four collections before us, which have been edited and joined together. Psalms xlii.-xlii. constituted a collection of songs of the sons of Korah, Psalms i. and lxxiii.-lxxxiii. a collection of songs of Asaph, Psalms li.-lxxii. a collection called "Prayers of David, son of Jesse." These three collections were all Elohistic. I am inclined to think that they originally followed one another in the order given, but by some accident a dislocation took place, and the "Prayers of David, son of Jesse" were inserted between the first and following songs of the Asaph collection, as at present. A Yahawistic editor added to these three collections a small collection of six largely composite psalms, and re-edited the songs of the other collections, inserting a few verses here and there, and adding several Yahawistic refrains. In this way the collection was made which now constitutes the second and third books of the Psalter. The existence at the close of Psalm lxii. of the colophon, "The Prayers of David, son of Jesse are ended," led later to a division of the collection at that point into two books, as we now have them.

Without stopping for the moment to exhibit the evidence that the collection of the first book antedates the collection of the second book, but assuming it temporarily as a fact, we may present the stages of the growth of the Psalter as follows:—

1. First collection, Psalms iii.-xli., to which were ultimately prefixed—at what stage I do not know—the anonymous Psalm ii., and also an introductory ode, Psalm i., out of the school of the proverb writers.

2. Three Elohistic collections, the Psalter of the sons of Korah, the Psalter of Asaph, and the "Prayers of David, son of Jesse."

3. These three Elohistic collections were re-edited and combined by a Yahawistic editor, and Psalms lxxxiv.-lxxxix. added.

4. This collection was divided into two books after

Psalm lxxii., thus making the Psalter to consist of three books.

5. A fourth book or collection was added.

6. The fourth book was divided into two to make the Psalter consist, like the Pentateuch, of five books, the division being made after Psalm cvi. for the reason already assigned.

The above analysis shows that the second and third books rest on earlier small collections, and suggests that the same may be true of the other books of the Psalter. Examining the psalm-headings as before, we find that in the first book all but four psalms are ascribed to David. These four are anonymous, i., ii., x., and xxxiii. As already stated, i. and ii. are later prefixes to the collection. Psalm x. is really a part of an alphabetic acrostic of which ix. is the first part; and in the Septuagint translation the two are still treated as one. They were evidently regarded as one when the present headings of the Hebrew text were prefixed, and the division into two psalms is of very late origin. For critical purposes the heading of Psalm ix. must be understood to refer to Psalm x. also. In the same way we may conclude that, at the time the headings were prefixed, Psalm xxxiii. was regarded as part of Psalm xxxii. The latter ends:—

“Be glad in Yahaweh, and rejoice, ye righteous :
And shout for joy, all ye that are upright in heart”;

and the former begins:—

“Rejoice in Yahaweh, O ye righteous :
Praise is comely for the upright.”

Owing to this similarity a connexion was made between these two hymns, with different metres and on different topics, analogous to that between the two parts of Psalm xix., Psalm xxxiii. being also of much later origin than xxxii., just as xix. 7-14 is later than xix. 1-6. In that editing of the first book of psalms which gave us the headings of the Hebrew text Psalms xxxii. and xxxiii. were treated as one psalm; later they were divided. Psalms iii.-xli., therefore, constituted a

collection which was known as "Of David," *i.e.* the Psalter of David, and which on the evidence of the headings is homogeneous.¹

Turning to the fourth and fifth books, we find, still on the evidence of the headings, that Psalms ciii.—cvii. and cviii.—cx. are ascribed to David, and their consecutive arrangement suggests that all of them were taken from the same collection, a so-called David Psalter. Psalms cxi.—cxvii. form an anonymous hallelujah collection, with cxvii. as doxology; and the arrangement points to a collection composed or arranged primarily for liturgical use in the Temple. Psalms cxx.—cxxxi., the "Songs of Degrees," are a pilgrim Psalter, a collection of popular, non-liturgical origin, composed and used first by pilgrims from Babylonia and Persia to the Temple at Jerusalem. Psalms cxxxviii.—cxliv. form a collection, each psalm of which, as in Book I., is headed, "Of David." Psalms cxlv.—cl. are a hallelujah chorus, composed or collected for liturgical purposes and headed by the title, "Praise-song of David."

By the testimony of the headings our Psalter is, then, largely a compilation from a number of smaller collections. I have already tried to show, in a general way, from the arrangement of the Psalter, that the collections of the second and third books are earlier than those of the fourth and fifth, and by analogy we should expect the collection of the first book to be earlier than those of the second and third. This general argument from arrangement finds confirmation in a comparison of psalms repeated in different collections, and by an examination of the relation of psalms to other psalms from which they quote. There are two cases of psalms appearing in both the first and second books. Psalm xiv. of the Yahawistic Psalter of David, constituting the first book of Psalms, appears in an Elohistic recension as Psalm liii. in the collection called "Prayers of David, son of Jesse," included in the second book of Psalms. By general consent, the Yahawistic recension of this psalm is the more original. The same is true of

¹ The musical notes suggest at least one earlier smaller collection, Psalms iii.—x.

Psalm xl. 13-17 of the Yahawistic first book, which appears in an Elohistic recension as Psalm lxx., also one of the "Prayers of David, son of Jesse." In neither of these cases can we assert that one was borrowed from the other, but merely that the form in the first book seems to be more original than that in the second. But in the case of Psalm cviii., in the fifth book, we find unquestionably direct borrowing from Psalms lvii. and lx. of the second book.

In the matter of citation the argument is similar. Psalms lxxxiv.-lxxxix. are composed largely of citations from paraphrases of or enlargements upon other Scriptures, including psalms which have preceded them in the order of arrangement. Psalm xcvi. cites xxiv., xlvi., and xlvi.; Psalm xcvi. cites xxx. and xxii.; Psalm cii. cites lxix.; Psalm cxxxv. uses cxv. and cxxxiv.; Psalm cxlii. is a mosaic of other earlier psalms—xxvii., xxviii., lxix., and lxxxiv.; and, not to extend the list unduly, Psalm cxlvii. makes use of xxxiii., civ., and others. These psalms all quote only psalms of books preceding them in the order of arrangement, with the possible exception of lxxxvi., which, it is claimed by some, also shows acquaintance with one or two psalms of the next collection—a claim which I do not regard as proved. The argument from repetitions, quotations, and references, therefore, supports the general argument from arrangement already presented; and we may lay it down as a general proposition, our working hypothesis, that the earlier psalms are to be found in the first part of the Psalter, particularly in the first book, and that the later psalms are in general to be sought in the last books.

Let us now take another step in our analysis. We have seen that our present five books of the Psalter were originally three in number, and that of two of these we are able to say positively, "This book, according to its own clear testimony, is made up of a number of minor collections." We have seen also that there is a very distinct mark of division between the first and the second of these original books, in that the first consistently uses Yahaweh as well as the name of God, and the second, except in six appended psalms, Elohim.

The last part of the Psalter, Psalms xc.-cl., like the first, uses the name of Yahaweh for God, except in Psalm cviii., which was borrowed from Psalms lvii. and lx. without change of the Divine name. On the other hand, it has one marked peculiarity of editing which distinguishes it sharply from both the first and second great collections. The psalms of those collections are not only provided with such headings as "Of David," "Of the sons of Korah," and "Of Asaph," they also have headings and notes which have reference to their musical execution. Many are headed, "Of the Director"; others have the names of the tunes to which they are to be sung; others are annotated with "Selah"; others have notices about the instruments to be used; and most of them are designated by some specific name, as "mizmor," "maschil," and "michtam." In the last part of the Psalter there are very few editorial notes of any sort, and the musical and liturgical notices cease altogether, with the exception of a very faint reflection of the former use in Psalm cix., and in the small collection cxxxviii.-cxliv., where it seems to be a mere imitation of the notes attached to the earlier collections which the authors of these psalms used so freely. The meaning of this fact has been pointed out by others. The collection xc.-cl. was edited as a part of the Psalter after those musical and liturgical notes in which the other collections abound had become a dead language. They were no longer in use, and apparently not even intelligible. It seems evident, therefore, that the first three books of the Psalter as a whole had been collected and edited not only before, but a considerable time before, the editing of the collections of the last two books. For it is only by the supposition of the lapse of a considerable interval of time that we can account for such a striking change of musical customs and musical language.

Having obtained a comparative date for the various books of the Psalter, let us examine the further question of absolute date. In 1 Chronicles xvi. 8-36 we find a psalm ascribed to David, and said to have been given by him on that day for the first time "to give thanks to Yahaweh by the hand of

Asaph and his brethren." But this psalm is composed from three psalms of the fourth book. Verses 8-22 are the first fifteen verses of Psalm cv., verses 23-33 are Psalm xcvi., and verse 34 is the old liturgical formula used in the sacrificial ritual, which was later used, as has already been pointed out, as the text of Psalms cvi., cvii., cxviii., and cxxxvi.

"Give thanks to Yahaweh, for He is good,
For His love endureth for ever."

The immediately succeeding verse, which quotes verse 47 of Psalm cvi., with the preface, "And say," serves to show that this is here to be regarded as a quotation from this psalm. Moreover, the following verse contains the doxology which is appended to this psalm in the Psalter. The same doxology marks the close of both the first and fourth books; but following it, as it appears at the close of the fourth book, is a rubric directing that "All the people shall say, Amen, praise Yah." This rubric is reproduced at the close of the hymn in Chronicles in the statement immediately after the doxology, "And all the people said, Amen, and Praise Yahaweh."

In view of this evidence I do not see how we can refuse to admit that the Chronicler had before him not merely a collection of psalms containing Psalms xcvi. and cv., but also the fourth book of psalms, already set off as a book by the addition of the doxology at the close of Psalm cvi. The evidence of the Book of Chronicles seems, therefore, to establish the fact that the fourth book of psalms had been set off as such as early as the year B.C. 330. If my former argument is correct, this would show that the third book already existed with the same number of psalms as the fourth book; that the second and first books in some shape, presumably much as at present, were already in existence; and that there was a fifth book of some sort, from which the fourth book had been arbitrarily set off, as already pointed out.

What were the limits of this fifth book in B.C. 330? It will

be observed, in examining the composite psalms and those that contain allusions to other psalms, that the quotations and allusions are from psalms in earlier collections. Now, beginning with Psalm cxxxv., we find three series of psalms, many of which are composite, and which use not merely psalms of the first three books of the Psalter, but also psalms of the fourth book, and of that part of the fifth book which precedes them in order. So Psalm cxxxv. is based on cxxxiv. ; cxxxvi., which rearranges and reuses part of cxxxv., is also acquainted with cxviii. and civ. Psalm cxlvii. makes use of civ. ; and several of the composite psalms of this and the immediately preceding group, if not directly quoting, are yet ordinarily regarded by commentators as evincing an acquaintance with various psalms of the fourth and the earlier part of the fifth books.

First Chronicles xvi. 8-36 makes use, as has been shown, of Psalms xcvi., cv., and cvi. ; and 2 Chronicles vi. 40-42 cites cxxx. and cxxxii., members of that collection of pilgrim psalms which closes with cxxxiv. There is no evidence that the Chronicler was acquainted with any of the last sixteen psalms of the Psalter. I venture therefore to affirm, in the first place, that the fifth book once closed, not as at present with Psalm cl., but with Psalm cxxxiv., which will be seen to have been an appropriate doxology ; and that the addition of the last sixteen psalms was of later date. The language of some of these psalms, like cxxxix., which is almost a patois, and could have been accepted for Temple use only at a time when Hebrew was a dead or dying language, suggests a very late date. A study of the contents of the group to which this psalm belongs, cxxxviii.-cxliv., suggests further that it can be most appropriately assigned to the period of the Antiochian oppression and the beginning of the Maccabæan uprising. The contents of the "Praise Song of David," cxlv.-cl., on the other hand, and more particularly of Psalm cxlix., almost compel us to assign this group to the time of the Maccabæan triumph. We may perhaps assume with Professor Cheyne a final revision of the Psalter under the direction of Simon

Maccabæus, and the formal addition at that period of Psalms cxxxv.—cxxxvii., and the two collections cxxxviii.—cxliv. and cxlv.—cl. With this the Psalter was definitely closed.

Toward the middle of the second century B.C., then, the final revision of the Psalter was completed and the last sixteen psalms were added; but as early as B.C. 330 five books of psalms, ending with Psalm cxxxiv., were in the hands of the Levitical singers, and used in the service of the Temple. This does not, of course, show us how long before B.C. 330 the collection consisting of Psalms xc.—cxxxiv. was made. But from the contents and the general character of this collection as a whole, we can say that it was made in a period of comparative prosperity and peace, and long enough after the adoption of the Law to allow for the growth of the legal idea, some time probably between B.C. 400 and 350.

We have seen that there was a considerable interval of time and growth between this collection and the collection of Psalms xlvi.—lxxxix., constituting Books II. and III. We have also seen that the Yahawistic collection, lxxiv.—lxxxix., represents the latest elements in those books, and belongs, as a collection, to the editor and reviser of the three Elohistic collections which precede it. Two of these psalms are peculiarly composite. One of these two, lxxxix., is historical, and treats of a period covered by both Samuel and Chronicles. As was to be expected from what has been already said, the author uses Samuel only, and shows no knowledge of Chronicles. The other, lxxxvi., quotes twice directly from the Pentateuch, both times from the ancient Yahawistic document. This might, of course, be accidental, but it supports the argument suggested by the necessity of placing between the third and fourth books a considerable interval, and an interval involving considerable change, that this collection was made before the promulgation of the Law by Ezra and Nehemiah. Analysing the contents of these six psalms, I think we must say that as a collection they are post-Exilic, but that they represent also a period of distress and humiliation. So Psalm lxxxiv. is a pilgrim psalm. Psalm lxxxv. speaks of the return from Exile as an accomplished

fact, but complains that God's indignation against His people is still felt. It represents the general feeling of the first post-Exilic century, with which we are familiar from Ezra, Nehemiah, and the post-Exilic prophets. Psalms lxxxvi., lxxxviii., and lxxxix., would, perhaps, have applied equally well to the Exilic period; but in consideration of Nehemiah's prayer (Neh. i. 5-11) and the general representations of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, they certainly may be regarded as not inapplicable to the period of relapse succeeding the rebuilding of the Temple and preceding the coming of Nehemiah as governor. Roughly we might date them as a collection between B.C. 500 and 450, and in dating them we date the collection of psalms now forming Books II. and III.

But each of the other three collections in those books was collected by itself before they were all collected together and re-edited by the compilers of the collection lxxxiv.-lxxxix., and each of these collections was itself earlier than the final collection, which I have dated B.C. 500-450. These three collections are all distinguished, as previously noticed, by a peculiar use of Elohim as the personal name of God. It has often been assumed that this is due to the editors, and that the appearance of "Yahaweh" in a few cases represents the original use which a later editor sought somewhat carelessly to obliterate. I think that it is susceptible of demonstration that in most cases Yahaweh is a later addition, due to a Yahawistic revision of Elohistic psalms. While there may be a couple of cases in which our present Elohistic are recensions of earlier Yahawistic psalms, there seems to be no more ground for regarding these three collections as a whole as an Elohistic revision of Yahawistic psalms than for regarding the Elohistic portions of the Hexateuch as recensions of earlier Yahawistic documents.

It has also been assumed that the use of Elohim as the personal name of God is late. This assumption has absolutely no ground on which to stand. Elohim instead of Yahaweh was used in the early-north-Israelite Elohistic code in the Hexateuch. It was used in the priest code in Genesis and

the first chapters of Exodus to represent the primitive, patriarchal belief as opposed to the Mosaic revelation. Outside of this it is almost never used. But in the later books, and noticeably in Ecclesiastes, we do encounter a very different use—that of *ha-Elohim*, “the God,” which should not be confused with the use of Elohim as a proper name. The Elohistic psalms and the Elohistic document of the Hexateuch stand together in this latter use, which evidently never became prevalent. It may be compared, perhaps, with the pre-Mohammedan movement towards monotheism at Mecca by the use of Allah as the name of Deity. But among the Hebrews the monotheistic movement ultimately assumed another form, emphasising Yahaweh as Israel’s God, and then as the only God, until the name became too sacred for utterance, and Adonai was substituted in its stead. We have in the use of Elohim in the middle books of the Psalter, as in the Elohistic document of the Hexateuch, interesting evidence of a movement towards monotheism on what at first sight look like more universal lines, by the elimination of national or peculiar names for the Deity; and the treatment of the name in the priest code might suggest that this movement could or did make a claim of primitive use. But however that may be, so far from the use of Elohim being a mark of late date, the opposite could more readily be maintained. For our purposes we may regard it as a neutral fact. In many interesting particulars we might compare the first book of the Psalter with the ancient Yahawistic document of the Pentateuch, the Elohistic portions of the second and third books with the Elohistic document, and the fourth and fifth books with the later priest code.

Turning to the general contents of the collections, one cannot but be impressed with the fact that the “Prayers of David” is, above all the collections of the Psalter (except possibly that collection cxxxviii.—cxliv., which we have referred to the period of the Antiochian oppression), the Psalter of agony and struggle. Psalms li.—lx. are one great cry of pain and affliction, and, though lxi.—lxiv. show a slight relief, they also represent a con-

dition of national calamity. One of these psalms, lxi., refers to a king as the national ruler ; more of them, like the close of li., refer distinctly to Exilic conditions ; lxv.-lxviii. are liturgical hymns of a joyous character ; and lxvi. and lxviii. seem to celebrate the deliverance from Babylonian exile in somewhat the strain suggested in Isaiah xi. and xii., and applied so freely in Deutero-Isaiah, namely, as a repetition of the deliverance from Egypt.¹ Psalms lxix.-lxxi. are of the same general nature as li.-lx. Psalm lxxii. is an ideal picture of the Messianic reign. This examination of the contents seems to show that Psalms li.-lxiv. were collected during the Exile, although one or two may have been composed in the troublous times immediately preceding. To this first collection were added, shortly after the Exile, seven more hymns, four of which were composed at the close of the Exile in that same triumphant spirit which marks Deutero-Isaiah.

Turning to the Psalter of the sons of Korah, xlii.-xlix., we find very different conditions. Parts only of two psalms indicate a period of national distress, the last stanza and the refrains of Psalms xlvi. and xlvi., and the second part of Psalm xlvi. ; these, as we have already seen, were the work of later editors and adapters, and not part of the original poems. Psalm xlvi., the only secular poem in the Psalter, is a royal marriage hymn, and, therefore, naturally joyful ; and Psalms xlvi.-xlvi., like the first part of xlvi., are triumph songs. Psalm xlix. is a contemplation of the riddle of life, in thought and language akin to the Wisdom literature. It is worthy of note that linguistically the Psalter of Korah stands by itself, finding its closest affinities probably with the psalms of Asaph. This must have been noticed, I think, by every one who has undertaken to analyse and tabulate the use of words

¹ Psalm lxviii. seems to me to be composed of two parts. The earlier, which begins with the raising of the ark (Num. x. 35) and closes with its resting (Num. x. 36), consists of verses 2-19, to which was given as a doxology verse 20. At a very much later date the remainder of the present psalm was added. It is to the original psalm that the above statement has reference. The text of both parts is corrupt.

in the Psalter. From the standpoint of art this collection represents the most finished lyric poetry of the Bible, although not the most forceful. From the standpoint of spiritual experience it falls below other collections which are poetically its inferiors.

Psalm xlvi. of this collection has ordinarily been supposed to be the lament in exile of a Levite, who mourned his deprivation of the Temple ceremonies. Others have referred it to some exile of a later date. All have recognised the unmistakable reference of the words (*v. 7*), "from the land of Jordan, and Hermonim, from Mount Mizar," or "from the little mountain," to the place of the sources of the Jordan, the modern Banias, where once stood the Hebrew temple of Dan; many, curious, and improbable, are the hypotheses invented to account for the presence of an exile at this spot. In fact, there is nothing to compel us to assume a condition of exile, and verse 5 would naturally suggest a very different idea. Accepting our present Masoretic Hebrew text, this verse reads literally: "These things I would call to mind, and pour out upon me my life, that I am wont to pass over in the throng, I lead (?) them to the house of God, with the sound of chant and praise-song, a multitude making *haj*"—that is, a feast of the nature of Tabernacles or Passover, involving a pilgrimage to a shrine. Now it seems to me that the natural interpretation of this passage, considering the allusion to the locality of the Dan temple in verse 7, and to the gushing forth of waters from the abyss beneath the earth in verse 8, is that it refers to the worship of the old temple of Dan. If in verse 7 we correct the Masoretic pointing from the Septuagint Greek text, we have part of a song appropriate to the great festival of Tabernacles as celebrated at that shrine. There is, of course, nothing unlikely in such borrowing by Jewish poets from Israelitic sources, as is shown by the numerous writings of the northern kingdom which have found their way into the Bible. Indeed, we know that Israel had developed a true literature while Judah still lingered in literary barbarism, and that it was the

fall of Samaria in the last half of the eighth century B.C., which, working on Judah as the fall of Constantinople in the fifteenth century A.D. worked on Italy, brought about a literary renaissance, a religious revival, and a reformation. In the literature of the northern kingdom which was thus inherited and appropriated by the Jews, we should naturally expect to find some of the psalmody which is referred to in Amos v. 23. I feel little hesitation in affirming that at the base of Psalm xlii. we have a specimen of that poetry. Psalm xlvi. has been referred by many, perhaps a majority of modern critics, to Israelitic sources, and with justice. The first two stanzas of Psalm xlvi. (2-7), which appear to constitute the more original part of that poem, would also gain in force if they could be referred to the temple at Dan rather than to that at Jerusalem.

Further than this, in the Asaph psalms, which, as noticed, are more closely allied to the Korah collection than any other collection in the Psalter, we find a curious exaltation of Joseph, Ephraim, and Manasseh. This has been explained by Professor Cheyne as a mark of late date and of reflection on the past. It certainly seems more natural to refer such allusions as those contained in Psalm lxxx. to an Israelite than to suppose a late Jew hypothetising himself into the position of one of the apostate people of the past, and, ignoring Judah utterly, crying out to God as the Shepherd of Israel, Who had led Joseph like a flock. While it is clear that the concluding stanzas of Psalm lxxx. are later than the fall of Samaria, it certainly seems more natural to refer the first stanza to an Israelitic origin. So, also, lxxxii. seems to have been originally a festival hymn from the same source, and the latter part of lxxvii. would bear similar treatment. If we have referred Psalms xlii. and xlvi. to the temple of Dan, we should naturally refer these psalms to the great Josephite temple at Bethel.¹ Such an origin of psalms lying at the

¹ Psalm lxxxix. contains a passage which must have been written in Galilee, namely, verse 13, where Hermon and Tabor are used as synonyms of north and south, a use which I think anyone who has visited the country will recognise as characteristically Galilean, and psychologically

base of these two collections might also, in view of the use of Elohim found in the north-Israelite Elohistic document of the Hexateuch, give some clue to the origin of the school in which this use was handed down.

It must be understood, however, that, as we now have them, these old Israelitic hymns have been worked over into Jewish Temple psalms, and that not all the hymns of either the Korah or Asaph collections are based on Israelitic originals. Indeed, Psalm lxxviii. is especially concerned to prove that God has cast off Joseph and chosen Judah. From the fact that this psalm apparently makes use only of the Yahawistic, Elohistic, and Deuteronomistic portions of the Hexateuch, as well as from the point at which it closes its historical retrospect, it would seem to be pre-Exilic. That the Psalter of Asaph, as a collection, is not pre-Exilic is manifest from the number of psalms which are prayers for deliverance from national calamity, six out of thirteen in our present arrangement.¹

Even the first book, although earlier than the second and third books, and probably earlier in the main than the individual collections which compose those books, is not, as a collection, earlier than the Exile, as is shown by the number of psalms which presuppose Exilic conditions. Out of forty-one

impossible for anyone but a Galilean. If written by a Galilean, it must have been written before the fall of Samaria. The psalm as we have it is evidently not pre-Exilic, but, as already stated, it is to a considerable extent a compilation, and this verse, with others immediately before and after it, the compiler seems to have borrowed or adapted from an old song of Israel.

¹ Psalms lxxiv. and lxxix., both of which occur in the Psalter of Asaph, present a difficult problem. On the ground of their position in the Psalter it seems, as Professor Robertson Smith has pointed out, almost impossible to refer them to the Maccabæan period, and on the ground of their contents it seems almost impossible to refer them to any other time. Is the difficulty to be solved by supposing them to be older psalms, which were remodelled and adapted to the circumstances of the Maccabæan revolt? It is difficult, also, to refer verses 6-9 of Psalm lxxxiii. to any other than the Maccabæan period, whereas the rest of the psalm, which is complete without verses 6-9, could equally well belong to an earlier date.

psalms, which constitute the book in its present shape, fifteen whole and two half psalms are songs of affliction. While national calamity is not so clearly stamped upon this book as it is upon the "Prayers of David" in the second book, there are yet a number of psalms which clearly indicate Exilic conditions, such as xiv., xxii., xxxv., the later portions of ix. and x., xxxviii., xxxix., and xl., the first part of which recalls forcibly the tone and language of Deutero-Isaiah. There are also later elements, like xix. 8-15, which clearly belongs to the post-Ezra legal period, and xxxiii., which might have been a psalm of the fourth or fifth book; but these seem to be of the nature of additions or insertions, and not to belong to that editing which gave this book its form as a collection. This book also contains earlier elements, like the royal hymns xx. and xxi., and perhaps the greater part of its bulk is pre-Exilic. In it are to be found probably the most forceful poems of the Psalter, and those containing the most primitive pictures of nature. Indeed, I should say that the first part of Psalm xviii. had scarcely emancipated itself from the worship of God in the phenomena of nature; while Psalm xxix., the "Song of Seven Thunders," certainly conveys a vivid impression of a God of the storm.

Space forbids me to enter into the discussion of the date at which Hebrew psalmody began, or of the relation of David to that psalmody. But I may say that in my judgment the evidence of tradition forces us to assign to David an important part in the development not merely of secular, but also of religious lyric poetry, between which the line that we now draw did not exist in the earlier times.¹ On the other hand, I think it not improbable that Davidic psalms have been so edited, adapted, added to, and subtracted from in the course of the centuries, that it is doubtful whether we can hope ever certainly to identify his handiwork.

That Hebrew psalmody began at an early age is also rather

¹ Compare, for instance, the contents of the hymns of the *Rigveda*.

indicated by what we know of Babylonian psalmody, both as to form and content. There is sometimes a curious identity of technical phraseology, as in the use of "how long" in both Babylonian and Hebrew penitential psalms. The conception of sin, including "secret sins," is strikingly alike in both ; and it has seemed to me that, in the very ancient Babylonian psalms, we sometimes find precisely those ideas which have been subjectively ascribed in the Hebrew Psalter to the later period. But this is a subject which yet awaits treatment, and my statements are perhaps little more than guesses.¹

The failure of the prophets to show a knowledge of the psalms, which has been urged as an argument for the non-existence of psalmody before the Exile, seems to me to have been much exaggerated. Jeremiah was evidently familiar with a body of psalmody, both penitential and liturgical, which in general character was similar to that which has come down to us. I do not mean that he quotes certainly from any psalms which we now possess ; but in the psalms which he himself composes, as for instance in chapter xx., he is evidently using a familiar model, which in form and method of thought and expression is identical with our psalmody. In other places he uses language evidently suggested by some psalm which in tone and language was of the same nature as many which we now possess. So also the earlier prophets, from Amos onward, in their treatment of the religious lyric make use of models evidently familiar, and by doing so testify

¹ The following fragment of a votive psalm, discovered by Professor Hilprecht of the University of Pennsylvania on a glass axe made in imitation of lapis lazuli and dedicated to Bel of Nippur by Nazi-Maruttash, King of Babylon in the fourteenth pre-Christian century "for his life (soul)," might have been addressed to Yahaweh by a pious Hebrew at any period covered by our Psalms :—

" That He may hear his prayer ;
Hearken unto his desire ;
Accept his prayer ;
Preserve his life ;
Make long his days."

to the previous existence of lyrical religious poetry used for purposes of psalmody. That no collections of pre-Exilic psalmody have come down to us, at least in their original form, is probably true; for psalmody seems to have had much the same history as ritual legislation. Antique in fact, it was remodelled in and after the Exile, and has not been preserved to us as a whole. The current method of criticism of the Psalter, which fails to recognise the older elements in the psalms because it dates them entire by their latest elements only, is as unscientific as it would be to date every portion of the Hexateuch on the evidence of the latest additions to the priest code.

This statement of the general problem of the Psalter is, naturally, very imperfect, and much which it would be desirable to consider has been of necessity passed over. My object has been to suggest a line of analysis which shall depend, in the first instance, on objective data rather than on subjective criteria, which all men see differently. Commencing from the end and going backward, I have outlined an evolution which follows in general the present arrangement of the Psalter, from the first book, of Exilic date, but resting on earlier pre-Exilic material, down to the final Maccabæan additions to the fifth book of the Psalter. According to this analysis we may, roughly speaking, look for the earliest psalms in the first collection of the first book, and for the latest in the last collection.

A study of the language, the form of the poetry, the figures, and the subjects of thought will, I think, support this hypothesis, but all these criteria except the first are dangerously subjective; and the test of language is beset with certain difficulties which make its application here doubtful. In their stead I would offer the results of a few analyses of the Psalter of a different nature, furnishing tests of a somewhat more objective character, which strikingly confirm the evidence, from heading, arrangement, etc., presented above. First let me reiterate the evidence from the general tone and contents of each collection. The contents of the first book are more

varied than those of any book, suggesting a greater range in time, and a broader, less ecclesiastical life. A majority of the psalms of this book are joyful or indifferent ; but a large minority, including re-edited forms of originally joyful psalms, express a sense of calamity, whether personal or national, and some of these make specific allusion to conditions of exile.

The contents of the Korah Psalter are in general happy or triumphant in tone ; but re-edited forms of two of the psalms indicate a period of national distress, and the closing psalm of the collection deals with the general question of calamity.

Almost one-half (six out of thirteen psalms) of the Psalter of Asaph is composed of psalms of distress, of which two specifically mention the Exile, while two represent a condition of religious persecution. The other psalms of this collection are either philosophical discussions of the problem of life, or poems of the triumphant judgments of God.

Of the "Prayers of David," seventeen out of twenty-two represent a condition of distress, oppression, and conflict, and some allude specifically to exile. The remaining five psalms at the close of the collection are joyful, and four of these, of a liturgical character, contain allusions to the Exile as a thing past.

Psalms lxxxiv.-lxxxix., largely unoriginal or compiled, contain four psalms of distress ; and one of them (lxxxviii.) is the only utterly hopeless psalm of the Psalter. Of these four psalms, one describes the conditions of the Exile ; another refers to the Exile as past, but depicts a condition of hope unfulfilled. Of the remaining psalms of this collection, one is a sweet Temple song, and the other a pæan of the triumph of Jerusalem over the nations through Divine power.

The psalms of Books IV. and V., as far as cxxxiv., are, almost without exception, joyful. They are, to a considerable extent, liturgical ; they display comparatively little variety of circumstance ; and they have an ecclesiastical tone quite in contrast to the first book.

In the small collection, cxxxviii.-cxliv., five psalms, all but

the first and the last, are a cry for deliverance from enemies on every side, and even cxxxviii. and cxliv. are hymns of conflict. There is much compilation in some of these psalms.

The "Praise Song of David" (cxlv.-cl.) is one paean of triumph.

Analysing the references to sacrifice or matters pertaining to sacrifice in the Psalter, we find in the first book sacrifice assumed without question, except in Psalm xl., and the simple, joyful side presented. Here, also, we find the king the sacrificer of the nation, and his sacrifices (xx. 4) are urged on Yahaweh as a ground for giving the nation help and victory. But in Psalm xl. we meet the prophetic protest against the childish, sacrificial view of religion. This view is emphasised more strongly in the second book, where one of the Asaphite psalms (l.) and two of the "Prayers of David" (li. and lxix.) assert most strongly the anti-sacrificial views of the prophetic school. On the other hand, li. is furnished with a sacrificial appendix ; and in the same collection (lvi. 13) we find the most anthropomorphic reference to sacrifice, as something pleasing God by its savour, in the whole Psalter. In the fourth and fifth books there is almost no mention of sacrifice (in cxviii. 27, "bind the sacrifice" is a rubrical direction, and not a part of the psalm). On the other hand, Aaron, the priests, and the Levites, who had not been mentioned in the first three books, come to the front in the fifth book. Judging from these references, we might say that the first book represents the more primitive conception of religion, and regards sacrifice as a thing in itself pleasing to God. Just at the close of this book we find an echo of the prophetic reformation ; while Books II. and III. as a whole, but more particularly the "Prayers of David," represent the period of storm and stress, containing both the most vehement denunciations of the sacrificial idea, and also the most anthropomorphic picture of sacrifice. Now this battle, as we learn from the prophets, began with Isaiah, reached its full development with Jeremiah, and ended with the close of the Exilic period. The final edition of the "Prayers of David" repre-

sents the outcome of this struggle, not the abolition of sacrifice, but that mystical treatment of it which rendered possible the addition of those closing verses to Psalm li. But this spiritualisation of sacrifice reached a further development, which is shown in the last books of the Psalter, where we find it clearly not banished, but removed, as it were, from the everyday life of the people into an inner court, and where this side of religion has become the function of a holy priesthood carefully organised and set apart, who are the leaders and representatives of the congregation.

Similarly it is in the fourth and fifth books only, leaving out of consideration the late first psalm and the second half of Psalm xix., that we find that exaltation and glorification of the Law which became so marked a feature in the Jewish religion after the time of Ezra.

An analysis of mythological references in the Psalter, anthropomorphisms in the representations of the nature and dealings of God, allusions to angels, survivals of polytheism, and the like, gives the same result of a development according to the arrangement of the Psalter as we now have it, and particularly of a distinct cleavage between the fourth and fifth books and the remainder of the Psalter. It is in Psalm lxxxvi. that we first find the clear statement, "Thou art God alone" (*v. 10*); while in the last books we find the expression of that idea represented much earlier by the prophets, that the gods of the heathen are "not gods" (*xcvi. 4, 5; cvi. 28*). In the earlier books, on the other hand (and there are survivals of this belief, in statement at least, in the last books), while Yahweh or Elohim is recognised as the God of Israel, the true God, and the great God, the psalmist is never able entirely to rid himself of the idea that the other gods have an actual existence. It is not until the fourth and fifth books, also, that we find those exalted conceptions of creation, God's relation to nature and His omniscience, which in the Hexateuch characterise the priest code in distinction from the Yahawistic and Elohistic writers (compare, for instance, Psalms civ. and cxxxix. *vi*, *xviii.*, *xxix.*, *lxxvii. 17-30*, *lxxx. 2-4*).

In the first book we find the “angel of Yahaweh” (xxxiv. 7; xxxv. 6, 7), as in the Yahawistic document of the Hexateuch; in the last books of the Psalter we find something of that heavenly hierarchy which was developed so fully in later Judaism, the angels, hosts, and ministers (xci. 11; ciii. 19-21; cxlviii. 2, etc.). With the growing perception of the infiniteness and superhumanity of God, He was removed farther and farther from contact with the human. Such primitive ideas and expressions as “see the face of God” (xlvi. 3), “sons of God” (xxix. 2; lxxxix. 7), and the like, became impossible. God was represented as acting, in the more common and mechanical view, through superhuman beings—the hosts of heaven, angels, and ministers; in the more spiritual view, by a breath, a word, a command (Genesis i.; Psalm civ. 7). This led ultimately to the hypostasising of the commandment or word of God, of which we find a trace in a late Maccabæan psalm (cxlvii. 15).

The treatment of the question of the future life in the psalms seems at first sight to contradict what I have said about a development in the Psalter from beginning to end. A considerable number of psalms in the first book, fifteen out of the thirty-seven Davidic psalms, treat of or refer to death and the after-state; and of these, three—xvi., xvii., and xxxvi.—are regarded by Professor Cheyne as showing a hope of, if not a belief in, personal immortality. In the Korahite Psalter he finds future hope in xlvi., in the “Prayers of David” in lxiii. (why not also in lxix.?), and in the Psalter of Asaph in lxxiii. Later than this in the Psalter even he finds no glimmer of such a hope. The theory of the fourth and fifth books is very distinctly that with death existence ceases, and that the blessings of God and the rewards of good and evil are to be expected here. In the earlier books, even including the Yahawistic collection which closes the third book, there seems to be ever and anon a restlessness under these conditions, a complaint against them, and a desperate search for a way out of death. But in the fourth and fifth books they are accepted and acquiesced in, and the theory of the satisfaction and

reward of religion and righteousness in this life appears to be regarded as sufficient. Only, possibly, in the collection cxxxviii.-cxliv. do we see some faint revival of the protests of the earlier collections. This looks at first sight like a retrogression, and in the line of spiritual development I suppose we must so regard it. Historically considered, however, it accords with the known history of religious thought among the Jews. The last two books of the Psalter, as already pointed out, belong to the Temple and the priesthood in a sense in which the other books do not. They are peculiarly tinged with priestly views. Now when in the second century B.C. we find the division between Pharisee and Sadducee an accomplished fact, it is the priestly aristocracy which constitutes the essence of the Sadducean party. The Sadducees were the conservatives, who maintained the older views—views which had been expressed by the authors of Job xxxii.-xxxvii., of Ecclesiastes, and Ecclesiasticus. It is to them, also, that we owe the first Book of Maccabees. The evidence of the Psalter is only what we might have expected from a consideration of the history of the times. The last two books of the Psalter belong to the period of the spiritual predominance of a priestly aristocracy, which, when the Pharisees developed into a party, became the Sadducees. The development of the Pharisees as a party, and with them the revival of discredited (cf. Zechariah xiii. 3-6) prophetic tendencies in the apocalyptic literature beginning with Daniel, was a result of the Antiochian oppression and the Maccabæan revolt. The idea of personal immortality springs into life in this literature.

Professor Cheyne has argued that the Jewish hope of immortality was due to Persian influences. An analysis of the references to death and the after-state, in the Psalter and in the Book of Job also, suggests the development of the hope of personal immortality out of the belief in family and national immortality. The discussion of the question of death belongs especially to periods of national calamity; and the glimmer of personal hope in the Psalms referred to, if it exists at all,

which I hardly believe, comes from the application to the individual of the consoling hope of national revival or continuance of life by posterity, which we find animating the prophets in the midst of apparent national death (cf. Ezekiel xxxvii., Isaiah liii. 10), and which clearly appears in the Psalms in such passages as xxii. 30-32, ix. 13, 14, 17, and others. It was the Antiochian oppression, followed by the successful national uprising under the Maccabees, falling at a time when, thanks to the Law and the synagogues, individual ideas of religion had begun to be developed, which finally converted a national into a personal belief. Persian influence, if it existed and helped to quicken this belief, did so through that discredited prophetic line which, after a period of dormancy, developed in a new form in Daniel and the Apocalypse, rather than through the psalmists.

Other analyses of a similar character seem to me to support that general view of the growth of the Psalter which I have already presented, and to confirm the dates which I have suggested for the various books and collections of the Psalter. As far as dates are concerned, the psalms should be grouped according to the evidence of the headings and their arrangement in the Psalter. Each individual psalm should be analysed to show its growth and editing, and the distinction carefully made between late psalms and early psalms re-edited by later hands.

CHAPTER IX

PSALM HEADINGS

ALL who read the Psalms in the Bible, whether in the King James or the Canterbury Version, are impressed and mystified by the curious headings. Turn, for instance, to Psalm lvii. in the King James Version, and you find this heading: "To the chief Musician, Al-taschith, Michtam of David." In the marginal note you find the Hebrew words *Al-taschith* and *Michtam* rendered, the former, *Destroy not*, and the latter, *A golden Psalm*. At first sight the words *Destroy not* seem to make no sense, and you are inclined to say that the translator must be mistaken; but if you will turn to Isaiah lxv. 8, you will find such an explanation of the words as proves that there is no mistake, and that the words possess an intelligible sense. There a reference is made to the popular vintage song that is sung regularly by the people when they pick the clusters of the grapes; when the new wine is found in the cluster, then they sing, "Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it."

The words *Al-taschith*, or "Destroy it not," which are placed at the head of this psalm are a liturgical direction, specifying a particular use for the psalm, namely, that it is to be sung at vintage. There are four psalms in all specified for this use by the same heading, *Al-taschith*, "Destroy not," namely, Psalms lvii., lviii., lix., and lxxv. Not that these psalms were written originally as vintage songs, but that they were designated at a certain period, in the arrangement of the Psalter for liturgical purposes, to be sung at the vintage.

Three other Psalms, viii., lxxxii., and lxxxiv., are designated

by their heading (“upon *Gittith*”) to be sung at the treading out of the grapes—wine-press songs, as the Greeks called their similar hymns. One of these Greek wine-press songs, by Anacreon, which lies before me as I write, reads as follows:—

“Only men tread the vine, setting free the wine,
Loudly praising God with wine-press songs.”

That it was customary for the Jews to sing such songs we learn from the writings of contemporary prophets. So in Isaiah xvi. 10 we read: “In the vineyards there shall be no singing, neither joyful noise; no treaders shall tread out wine in the presses; the shout I have made to cease.” And Jeremiah xxv. 30 reads, “Yahaweh shall roar from on high, and utter His voice from His holy habitation; He shall mightily roar against His foes; He shall give a shout as they that tread the grapes.”

Reading these seven psalms, which are designated as psalms for the vintage and for the treading of the grapes, we find that there is not the slightest reference in the psalms themselves either to the vintage or to the treading of the presses. We do not know at what time these headings were prefixed to the psalms, but the style of them should be sufficient to convince anyone that it was done at an intensely pietistic period, when the life of the people was becoming more and more absorbed in its religion. The religious leaders of the people were even endeavouring to drive out profane, that is secular, songs and hymns, providing the people with spiritual songs and hymns to sing on all occasions. Study the four psalms which are appointed for the vintage psalms, that is, the four “Destroy not” psalms, and you will be puzzled to ascertain any principle on which the director of the liturgy assigned these particular hymns for this purpose. They are not even joyous in character. The three hymns headed “For the pressing of the Grapes”—for I suppose that we should translate in this manner the words “set to *Gittith*,” or “upon *Gittith*,” which are the translations given in the Revised and King James Versions, respectively—are, however,

joyful songs. The first of them, Psalm viii., is one of the beautiful nature hymns of the Psalter; Psalm lxxxi. commences joyfully and ends with a beautiful promise; and Psalm lxxxiv. is beautiful and amiable throughout. Nevertheless, there is nothing in any of them which has any reference to the treading of grapes. They were not composed with the vintage in mind, and were merely assigned to that use by the liturgical directors, when they undertook out of the Temple Psalm Book to provide the people with hymns for all occasions.

Two psalms (xxxviii. and lxx.) are designated by their headings for a particular sacrificial rite. In our Authorised Bibles these psalms are headed, "to bring to remembrance." In the Revised Version there is a note, "to make memorial." The translation should be, "to make the *azkara*," or memorial offering, which is described in Leviticus xxiv. 7, 8: "And thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row, that it may be on the bread for a memorial (*azkara*), even an offering made by fire unto Yahaweh. Every Sabbath he shall set it in order before Yahaweh continually." Every Sabbath the shewbread was renewed, and every Sabbath the *azkara*, or memorial, was offered. In the liturgical arrangement of the Psalter, as indicated by the headings which have come down to us, it was directed that one or the other of these two psalms, xxxviii. or lxx., should be sung. If you will turn to them, you will notice that Psalm xxxviii. is distinctly of a penitential character; Psalm lxx. is briefer and more joyful. It seems as though the intention were to allow the use of one or the other, according to the different seasons or the different circumstances, just as alternative chants are provided in our ritual, one being used where a more penitential tone was required, and the other under ordinary circumstances.

Psalm c., which is very familiar to every Churchman, from its constant use in our services, was also appointed to be used for a special liturgical purpose. In the King James Version it is designated as "A Psalm of praise," and in the Revised Version as "A Psalm of thanksgiving"; but in the

Revised Version you find a note, giving an alternative reading, "for the thank offering." This is the correct rendering of the words. The thank offering referred to is the one described in the provisions of the ritual code in Leviticus vii. 11, 12: "The law of the sacrifice of peace offerings . . . when a man offers them for a thanksgiving."

It is possible that Psalm xxii. was also appointed for use in connexion with a sacrifice, namely, the morning whole burnt sacrifice. The heading of the Psalm is, as it is translated in our King James Version, in the marginal note, "The hind of the morning"; and it is ordinarily supposed that "To the hind of the morning" means "This is to be sung to the tune known as the Hind of the Morning." It is, however, possible, and some of the very earliest interpretations of this heading give this rendering, that the words mean, "To be sung at the time of the morning sacrifice." This use of psalms in connexion with sacrifice was a very early one. In old Arabian sacrificial usage the *tahlil*, or praise cry, uttered when the blood was poured out, was an essential feature of the sacrificial ritual. Similarly in early Hebrew use the sacrifice was accompanied by a *tahillah* (the same root as the Arabic *tahlil*), or praise cry. Later these *tehilloth*, or praise cries, were developed into psalms.

Psalm xxx. was appointed to be sung at the Feast of the Dedication. The translation of this heading in the King James Version is misleading, namely, "A Psalm and Song at the dedication of the house of David." Properly, the words "of David" form a sentence by themselves. It is the same heading which we find in all the Psalms, xxx.-xli. They belong to the so-called Davidic Psalter, or Psalm Book, and each Psalm is headed "of David." It should read, "A Psalm. A Song for the Temple Dedication. Of David." We learn in 1 Maccabees iv. 52 and following verses that in the year B.C. 165, after the Temple had been purified, a new altar was dedicated, and we know that later this occasion was observed as the Feast of the Dedication, which is referred to in St. John's Gospel x. 22. Was it for this festival

that this psalm was prescribed? It is peculiarly appropriate for such a purpose, but it is difficult to suppose that a liturgical psalm-heading of this character could have been composed so late.

Psalm xcii. is another of those which had a special use in the ritual. It is appointed to be used on the Sabbath day, and it is certainly beautifully adapted to that purpose. One asks, If there were a psalm appointed for the Sabbath, were there not also psalms appointed for the other days of the week? The headings of the Psalter, as they have come down to us in the Hebrew, show no such appointment, but on consulting the Greek and Latin translations, and the notes of the Talmud on the use of the Psalter, we find such appointments. Psalm xxiv. was appointed for Sunday, the first day. If you will turn to this psalm you will see at once why it was chosen; the first part of the psalm makes you think of the beginning of creation. Psalm xlvi. for Monday and lxxxii. for Tuesday do not have any such evident appropriateness, neither do xciv. for Wednesday, lxxxii. for Thursday, or xciii. for Friday.

The Greek translation also tells us that Psalm xxix. was appointed to be sung on the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles. This psalm, if we were to give it a heading in English fashion, we should probably designate as "The Song of the Seven Thunders." It describes a thunderstorm. You will remember that in Hebrew use thunder is designated by the words, "Voice of Yahaweh." Read over this psalm, with its sevenfold repetition of "The Voice of Yahaweh," thinking each time you read them of the thunder peal, and the thunderstorm will be brought very vividly and realistically before you, breaking over Palestine from the north, sweeping southward, and finally disappearing in the desert. And after the destruction and violence of the storm comes the calm and peace that make you think of the gentleness of the presence of God. (Another well-known description of the thunderstorm as the manifestation of the God of Israel is contained in the first part of Psalm xviii., where the hailstones and the coals

of fire are the flashes of lightning that reveal the presence of God hidden in the blackness of the thunder clouds.) Psalm xxix. was not, however, written for the purpose of being sung on the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles. That was the use to which it was finally assigned.

In addition to such liturgical designations as those to which I have already referred, there are a number of others, some of them older and some of them later, and many of them quite unintelligible to us of the present day, as they were also to those who translated the Psalter out of the Hebrew into Greek, long before the time of Christ. In connexion with Psalms lvii., lviii., and lix., I have called attention to the word *Michtam*, which is translated in a margin note of the King James Version, "The golden Psalm." This heading appears in Psalms lvi. and lx., but no one knows what it means. The heading *Lammenazzeah* occurs in the superscriptions of fifty-five psalms. It is ordinarily rendered "To the chief Musician." The new Polychrome Bible renders it "For the Liturgy." In point of fact, we do not know what it means.

Psalms iv., vi., liv., lv., lxvii., and lxxvi. are described in the King James Version as being "on Neginoth." Apparently this means "with string music," and refers to the accompaniment to be used with the psalm when used in the Temple service. (Mizmor, a heading frequent in the Psalms, may also indicate an accompaniment of stringed instruments, since *zammer*, the verb from which it is derived, means to twitch or play the strings). The reverse of this is found in the case of Psalm v., which is described in the King James Version as being "upon Nehiloth," which appears to mean "with wind instruments." "Upon Alamoth," which we find as the superscription of Psalm xlvi., has often been supposed to mean with high-pitched tenor or soprano voices only; but the Polychrome Bible renders "with Elamite instruments." Psalm xii. bears the superscription "upon Sheminith," which means literally "on the eighth," and is supposed to mean "on the octave," or, according to the Polychrome Bible, "in the eighth mode." The *Selah*, which we find frequently, not

as a heading, but in or at the close of psalms, indicates a gloria or refrain.

It is ordinarily supposed that the heading, "to the Lilies," or "to the Lily," or "to the Lilies, a testimony," which appears in the superscriptions of Psalms xlv., lx., lxix., and lxxx., are the names of a tune or tunes to which these psalms are to be sung. Similarly the superscription of Psalm lvi., "To the dove of the distant terebinths," if the words may be so translated (they are not translated in the King James Version, and the Polychrome Bible translates them, "to the tune of the dove of the far-off islands"), is also the name of a tune. According to the Polychrome Bible, the heading of Psalm liii., "upon Mahalath," also gives the catchword of a tune, "to the tune of Sickness," etc.

There are, as already said, a number of liturgical headings which either are not yet satisfactorily explained, or for which no explanation is offered. You will find these for the most part untranslated, merely transliterated from the Hebrew in the King James Version. So in Psalm ix. you will find the heading, "To the chief Musician upon Muth-labben." Psalm vii. is called a "Shiggaion"; Psalm xxxii. a "Maschil"; Psalm xxxix. is "to Jeduthun." (In verse 16 of Psalm ix. also we have a musical term, *higgaion*, the sense of which is unknown).

If you will study your Psalter carefully, you will observe that musical headings of the sort above described are practically confined to the first three books of the Psalter. After Psalm lxxxix. they cease. This shows, as pointed out in a previous chapter, that the psalms contained in the first three books of the Psalter—i. to lxxxix.—had been worked over and arranged for liturgical purposes, set to their music and accompaniments, and the like, before the last two books of the Psalter were added. The first three books form a collection in this respect quite separate and distinct from the last two books of the Psalter; at the time when the last two books were added these liturgical terms had ceased to be used, and were presumably unintelligible. We know from the Greek

translation of the Psalter that they were no longer intelligible when that was made, for in it they are not translated, but for the most part transliterated.

In a previous chapter I have dealt with the heading, "A Song of Degrees," and with the collection bearing that title, namely Psalms cxx.-cxxxiv. It is now generally agreed that the proper translation is "A Pilgrim Song," and this little collection was, therefore, a pilgrim Psalter, collected for the use of, and sung by the pilgrims who came up year by year to worship at the Temple in Jerusalem.

There are a number of psalms bearing historical headings. These are especially frequent in the first half of the collection designated "Prayers of David," li.-lxxiii. An examination of these headings will show that they were taken from the historical books, and that the psalms bear on the whole no relation to the events referred to in the headings. Apparently the title "Prayers of David" suggested to some Jewish scholar, who understood the title literally, to connect them with David's history as related in the books of Samuel. He did not go all through the "Prayers of David" in this manner, but only through the first half, Psalms li.-lxiii. Afterwards his unfinished work found admirers, and his proposed identifications were placed at the heads of the psalms he had annotated. In the first book of Psalms, the Psalter of David, there are also three psalms, iii., vii., xviii., with historical headings. Psalm xviii. appears again in the Book of Samuel, and its position there explains its title. Given the belief that David wrote Psalm iii., the reason of the present heading is apparent. Whence the heading of Psalm vii. is derived, or what is the event or the individual referred to, has not yet been made out.

There are, further, one or two psalms near the close of the whole collection of Psalms, namely, the cxxxix., cxl., and cxlii., which have liturgical directions like those in the first part of the Psalter. These belong to a small collection of late date, entitled "Psalms of David," consisting of Psalms cxxxviii.-cxlv., which appear to have been modelled after

and to have borrowed their headings, already unintelligible, from the "Psalms of David" in the older Psalter.

It may be that some day we shall make discoveries with regard to the ancient Hebrew music, similar to, or even more important than, the discoveries about Greek music made by the French at Delphi. In the meantime, speculative and philological study seem to have reached their utmost limit in the interpretation of these psalm headings.

I have already pointed out that the psalms which are designated by their headings for certain particular purposes, such as vintage songs and the like, were not originally written for that purpose. In the case of a great part of the Psalms we are unable to say that they were written for any specific purpose; they are quite indefinite and general in their form, and whatever may have been the occasion of their composition, they have been so modified in the liturgical use that we can no longer determine when or why they were composed. There are, however, in the last two books of the Psalter, quite a number of psalms which were written just as they stand for liturgical use. We have, also, several hymns composed as processionals, like lxviii. and cviii. Psalm xlv., which is, by the way, the least religious hymn of the Psalter, is a marriage hymn, and is, in fact, so designated in the heading; there are also several harvest hymns, of which lxv. is the most beautiful.

In conclusion, let me cite a part of this last-mentioned psalm, which is, as it seems to me, one of the most exquisite descriptions of the country, rich to the harvest, that has ever been written.

"Thou didst visit the earth and water it,
Greatly enriching it
(God's river is full of water),
Preparing their corn,
For thus Thou preparest it :
Her furrows watering, her ridges smoothing,
With showers Thou softenest her, her sprouting
Thou blessest.

“Thou hast crowned the year with Thy goodness,
Whose chariot wheels drop fatness.
Wilderness pastures run over,
And the hills are girt with joy.
The meadows are clad with flocks,
And the valleys clothed with grain.”

You will appreciate still more the beauty of this, if you will recollect the character of the hills of Palestine, and how the fields were terraced one above another up the steep mountain slopes, so that the wilderness pastures did very literally run over the one into the other, and the hills were girt about in great bands with girdles of different harvests.

CHAPTER X

THE STORY OF THE PRAYER BOOK PSALTER

I PRESUME that every intelligent Churchman has noticed the difference between the psalms as we have them in the Prayer Book and as we have them in the Bible, but I imagine that there are many who, although they have noticed the difference, have not reflected upon the meaning and the cause of that difference. There are still more, I fancy, who do not know why we sing or say the Psalms through once a month, theoretically at least, nor when and why that peculiarly Anglican method of using the Psalms was adopted.

Now of course every one knows that the Psalms were originally written in Hebrew, and that they constituted what we may call the authorised hymn-book of the Jewish Church. Together with the rest of the Hebrew Old Testament they were translated into Greek for the use of the Greek-speaking Jews of Alexandria, a translation which is ordinarily known as the Septuagint. Later other translations into Greek were made, some more literal and some less so, some better and some worse. These translations were used quite indiscriminately, as it would appear, in the early Christian Church, the members of which spoke Greek, and not Hebrew. Indeed, there were in the early Church, after the Apostolic age, almost none who understood Hebrew at all. As there was no authorised or official translation, occupying a place like that which the King James or Authorised Version holds with us, these various Greek versions not only became very much mixed up with one another, but a great many corruptions crept into the text. As

the Church spread over the West, where Latin was the language of the people, the Greek versions of the Scriptures were in their turn translated into Latin, with the natural result that the Latin translations from the Greek were still more corrupt, inaccurate, and farther removed from the original Hebrew than the Greek translations from which they were made. The Latin translation best known to us, and indeed the only one of which we have any real knowledge before the time of Jerome, is the so-called *Itala*, a translation supposed to have been made in the Church of Northern Africa.

Some time in the first half of the second century after Christ, Origen, the greatest Christian scholar of his day, disturbed by the many and serious inaccuracies of the Greek translations then in vogue, undertook to collate the various Greek translations and compare them with the Hebrew original for the purpose of obtaining a more correct text; a work which brought him into much disfavour at the time, although it won him fame and honour at a later date. More than a hundred years later St. Jerome, secretary to Pope Damasus of Rome, undertook to do for the Latin Bible much the same thing which Origen had done for the Greek. At first, however, his idea seems to have been merely to make the Latin Bible a more correct translation of the Greek, for at that time he had no knowledge of Hebrew. Indeed, the Greek translations appear to have been regarded as inspired equally with the original Hebrew, so that it probably seemed to him quite enough to correct the Latin and bring it into harmony with the Greek. His first work was done on the Psalter, which was the part of the Old Testament most freely used in the services of the Church, being the hymn-book of the Christian just as it had been of the Jewish Church. His aim was to bring the *Itala*, the Latin translation of which we have already spoken, more into harmony with the Greek. This revision of the *Itala* version of the Psalms was adopted as the Roman Psalter. It was not a thorough work, as Jerome only attempted to correct the most glaring errors of the old translation, and he himself was not satisfied with it. Accordingly, a little later

he made a new translation from the Greek, for he had not yet, I believe, conceived the idea of translating directly from the original Hebrew. Indeed, it was a very unpopular thing then as it is now, to propose to correct any errors in Bible translations, no matter how patent they might be, and Jerome was roundly abused for his pains, and accused of upsetting the faith and tampering with the truths of Holy Scripture; very much such accusations as are sometimes brought against Biblical scholars nowadays, when they venture to propose any correct of the received text of the Bible. People regarded him as enemy of the Bible, who was attacking it, and not as a lover of the truth, who was trying to remove error and let the Christians see exactly what the Bible really said. Even the fanatical St. Augustine wrote against Jerome's work, believing that he was upsetting the whole system of theology by showing people through his correction of the received translation of the Latin cause that there were errors in that translation, and in some cases errors which had been used as proof-texts.

Fortunately, however, Jerome, in spite of all abuse and opposition, kept on with his work. He soon saw that a translation from the Greek into Latin was not sufficient, and decided to attempt to translate the Old Testament directly from the Hebrew into Latin. But this was no easy task. Churchmen who knew Hebrew, and it was necessary to find a Jew who, in spite of the prejudices on both sides, should be willing to teach him that language. Then it was a difficult matter to obtain a Hebrew text, since into Greek were carefully guarded by the Jews, that they might be better and sometimes into the hands of those whom they counted as their enemies. As Jerome's temper was, and outrageous as was his, the members in some respects, he yet certainly earned from indeed, there was the title of saint by the persistence and courage, almost none who he overcame all obstacles until he finally succeeded in authorising the translating the Old Testament into Latin, at which the Kirche the Hebrew. He did not, to be sure, obtain from us, these various work at once, and it was not until long after mixed up with corruption through its manifest merits his translation fitted into the text.

use as the Bible of the Western Church. It is this translation which, with some change and corruptions, has come down to us as the Vulgate, except only in the case of the Psalter, the translation of which in the Latin Vulgate is not St. Jerome's translation from the Hebrew.

The Psalter was the hymn-book of the Church, familiar from childhood to every Christian. The old Latin translation had, in the mouth of the Church, sung itself into a real hymn form, and at the same time it had sung itself into the affections of the people, and could not readily be displaced. Jerome's translation from the Hebrew was undoubtedly more correct as a translation, but it deviated too much from the familiar form of the old Latin translation so long used in the Church, and was not, moreover, so well adapted to singing. Nevertheless the old translation was so glaringly incorrect that it was manifest to the more scholarly men in the Church that some sort of a change must be made. Jerome's correction of that translation by a comparison with the Greek was, as we have seen, adopted at Rome, and came to be known as the Roman Psalter. But this also was too clearly incorrect, and so at last, more than a century and a half after Jerome's death, and two hundred years after the completion of the work itself, his second Psalter, the translation from the Greek, which was nearer to the old Latin Psalter in its phraseology than his translation from the Hebrew, and which was also better adapted than that for use as a hymn-book, was adopted for Church use in Gaul by the famous Gregory of Tours, it is said, and from Gaul spread over the whole Western Church, until it was finally incorporated in the Vulgate, or Latin Bible. From the place of its adoption it came to be known as the Gallican Psalter.

At the time of the Reformation, then, the Psalter in use in the Western Church was a Latin translation made by St. Jerome from previous Greek translations, and not directly from the original Hebrew. Now before the Reformation many of the Psalms of this Gallican Psalter had already been translated into English and made known to the people through

the so-called primers which preceded the Prayer Book, so that when the Reformation came the people were already familiar with some portions of the Gallican Psalter in an English dress. This seriously influenced translators of the Bible, and when finally the Bible of 1539, Coverdale's translation, emended by Cranmer and others, the Great Bible, as it was called, was adopted by the English Church for use in public readings, it was the Latin Psalter, translated by St. Jerome from the Greek, and not the Hebrew, which was adopted as the basis of the Psalter translation. This translation was, to be sure, corrected somewhat after the Hebrew, and the Hebrew numbering of the Psalms was adopted instead of the Greek numbering used in the Gallican Psalter of St. Jerome; but after all, it was really the Latin Psalter, and not the Hebrew, which was translated into English and adopted as the Psalm Book of the English Church. This translation was beautifully adapted to singing, and soon sang itself into popular favour, as the old Latin Psalter had done before it.

In 1611 the King James, or Westminster Revision of the Bible appeared. It was a much more correct rendering of the Bible from the original languages than any which had previously been published, and was adopted as the authorised version. But Prayer Book changes are hard to make, and it was not until 1662, fifty years later, that this translation was adopted for the Epistles and Gospels instead of the translation of 1539, which had been used up to that time. It was the intention in this revision of the Prayer Book in 1662 to change all the passages of Scripture used in the Prayer Book from the translation of the Great Bible to that of the Authorised, or King James Version; but the same thing happened in the case of the Psalter which had happened before in the Latin-speaking churches of the West. The Psalter had so sung itself into the affections of the people that it could not be changed. Moreover, the old Psalter, the one translated from the Latin, was much better adapted to singing than the newer and more literally accurate translation from the Hebrew, which was stiff and prosaic in comparison.

So it came to pass that the old translation of the Psalter was retained, and has come down as the Psalter of the Church. Our Psalter is, then, a translation from the Latin of St. Jerome, which is in its turn a translation from the Greek, which in its turn was translated from the original Hebrew. Such is the history of the translation of the Psalms contained in our Prayer Book Psalter. It may be added that although this translation, viewed from the standpoint of literalness, is inferior to that contained in the King James Version of the Bible, it is, nevertheless, far superior to it in that it has caught something of the swing and spirit of Hebrew poetry, and it is, therefore, much to be preferred for liturgical use, where pedantic accuracy is a matter of secondary importance.

So much for our Prayer Book translation of the Psalter. Now let us consider the use of the Psalms in the services of the Church, and first of all, of the Jewish Church. If you will turn to Psalms xxxviii. and lxx., in the Canterbury or Revised Version of the Bible, you will find in the headings of those psalms these words, "to bring to remembrance," and in the margin you will find an alternative reading, "to make memorial."

Now the word translated "bring to remembrance," or "make memorial," means literally "to make *azkara*." The *azkara* was that part of the meal or vegetable offering called "meat offering," in the Authorised translation of the Bible, which was cast into the sacrificial fire as God's portion. These psalms were appointed to be used in the Temple in connexion with the sacrifice or office of the *azkara*.

Turning to Psalm xcii. in the Canterbury Revision, you will see that this is headed, "A Psalm, a Song for the sabbath day." That is to say, this psalm was appointed to be sung in the sacrificial service in the Temple on the Sabbath day. But if there was a psalm which was appointed to be sung on the Sabbath day, it would seem probable that there were stated psalms for other days also, since there were sacrifices on those days; and from a study of the Jewish traditions preserved to us by the rabbis, we find that this was actually the case.

Psalm xxiv., we are told in the Talmud, was appointed for Sunday, xlviij. for Monday, lxxxii. for Tuesday, xciv. for Wednesday, lxxxij. for Thursday, and xciii. for Friday. These constituted the psalters for the respective days in the service of the daily morning sacrifice in the Jewish Temple, and were sung week in and week out. But we also learn from Jewish tradition that on certain special occasions special psalms were used in place of the psalter for the day, as, for instance, Psalm lxxxij. at morning sacrifice, on the new moon of the seventh month. We also learn that there were psalms appointed for the service of evening sacrifice in the Temple. So, on the same new moon of the seventh month, Psalm xxix. was to be used at the evening sacrifice. These selections were, it will be observed, very short in comparison with our present use, rather resembling in that regard what we now know as anthems. So when in the Jewish service Deuteronomy xxxii. was appointed to be used—the Song of Moses—it was divided into six sections, one of which was considered enough for a service. But there were also occasions on which an entire group of psalms was appointed to be sung, the most famous of these groups being the *Hallel*, Psalms cxi.—cxviii., which was sung at the feasts of the Passover and Dedication, and the fifteen Psalms of Degrees, sung at the Feast of Tabernacles.

The Jews were in the habit of treating the psalms quite freely for liturgical purposes, abbreviating them, as we have already seen, in the case of the Song of Moses, or combining psalms or portions of psalms to make new psalms for special occasions. This is well shown in the case of the composite psalms in the Psalter, like Psalm cviii., which is composed of verses 8-12 of Psalm lvii. and 6-12 of Psalm ix. It is still better shown by the psalm of dedication contained in 1 Chronicles xvi., which is composed from Psalms cv., xcvi., and cvi., containing not a single original verse.

The Jews were also in the habit of singing a doxology, or ascription of praise after each chant or selection of psalms. So the chant just alluded to in 1 Chronicles xvi. concludes with

the doxology, "Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel, from everlasting even to everlasting." Each book of the psalms in the Hebrew Psalter concluded with such a doxology, which was intended to be sung after the various psalms or groups of psalms used in the worship of the Temple. These doxologies are unfortunately printed in our Bibles as though they were component parts of the psalms immediately preceding, but you can readily distinguish them by turning to the Canterbury Revision. They are verse 13 of Psalm xli., verses 18 and 19 of Psalm lxxii., verse 52 of Psalm lxxxix., and verse 48 of Psalm cvi., which latter is the same as verse 13 of Psalm xli., the doxology of the first book, except that it contains a rubric directing all the people to say "Amen," and that it has a hallelujah added at the end. There are also two doxologies in the Psalter which are printed as separate psalms, namely, Psalm cxvii., which was originally the doxology to a Hallelujah collection consisting of Psalms cxi.-cxvii., and cxxxiv., which, from the position in which it is placed, looks as though it might have been the doxology of the collection of Psalms of Degrees when they were used in the services of the Feast of Tabernacles. Psalm cl., which is a still longer doxology than either of these, forms the close of another group of psalms intended for liturgical use in the Temple service, beginning with Psalm cxlv. These three doxologies would seem to have been intended for use at the close of the particular groups of psalms after which they are printed, very much as in America in some churches the *Gloria in Excelsis* is sung at the close of the entire evening Psalter. The lesser doxologies at the close of the first four books of psalms resemble rather our *Gloria Patri*, and were intended to be used after any psalms taken from those books which might be sung in the Temple service. It must be remembered, moreover, that when those doxologies were put there, these various books were so many separate collections or hymn-books, as though it were *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, *The Hymnal*, etc. At the close of each of these collections or hymnals was printed a doxology in the same way in which is printed at the

close of the American hymnals a selection of doxologies to be used after the various hymns therein contained. But whereas our method of hymn-singing requires us to use different doxologies for different metres, and hence to print a number of variant forms of the doxology at the close of our hymnals, their metres and their method of singing rendered it possible to sing the same doxology to every psalm, and hence only one doxology had to be provided at the close of their hymn-books.

But not only did the Jewish Church have the same method of using doxologies which we now have, and which indeed we borrowed from them, it had also the same method of using the amen and the hallelujah. So at the close of the chant to which I have already referred in 1 Chronicles xvi., we are told that "all the people said, Amen, and Hallelujah"; and at the close of Psalm cxi. there is a rubric, unfortunately printed in both our Bibles and Prayer Books as part of the psalm itself, to this effect, "And let all the people say, Amen, Hallelujah." It was the practice, in other words, at the close of the doxology to respond, "Amen." This was also the practice after prayers, as we know, and the Christians adopted that practice from the Jews. It was also, as the cases just cited and others show, the practice after doxologies, and, therefore, in placing an amen at the end of the *Gloria Patri*, the Christians were but copying the old Hebrew use. So also when after some of our praise hymns, especially in the Easter season, we sing "Hallelujah," we are but copying the old Jewish use again. In fact, the *amens* and *hallelujahs* in the Psalter are not original parts of the psalms with which they are connected, but liturgical directions, if I may so express it, like the *amens* which we sing at the close of our hymns.

To sum up, the Jews had a daily Psalter, arranged according to the week, not the month. They had special psalms for special festivals. They composed anthems by divisions and combinations of the psalms, as well as by new compositions. They sang a doxology at the close of each selection of psalms used in a service and at the close of anthems. They made

use at the close of the doxology of the response, Amen. They used liturgically, sometimes at the close of their hymns and sometimes at the beginning, the ascription of praise, Hallelujah.

When the Christian Church was founded the Psalter became the hymn-book of the Christians as it had been of the Jews, and the early Christians not only continued to use the ancient Psalter, but also adopted its spirit and began to compose new psalms, as the Jews had done before them. For while the Psalter as we have it was closed about one hundred and fifty years before Christ, the Jews after this date still continued to compose psalms on the ancient models, which, if they were not adopted into the canonical hymn-book, that is, the Psalter, were, nevertheless, used by pious Jews for purposes of sacred song. One considerable collection of this sort, composed by Pharisees some forty years or so before the birth of our Lord, is still extant, being generally known as the "Psalms of Solomon." These Psalms, as we have them, are written in Greek, but are supposed to be translated from a Hebrew original. They illustrate the development of Jewish thought and belief, particularly with regard to the coming of the expected Messiah, between the close of the Old Testament canon and the birth of Jesus. As an example of the contents of these psalms, let me quote a part of the second psalm, in which allusion is made to the death of Pompey. After picturing the misery and degradation of Jerusalem through the wickedness of her own children, culminating in the occupation of the city by Pompey the Great and the Romans and the profanation of the Temple itself, the psalm passes into a prayer to God for deliverance and vengeance, followed by a triumphant description, if we may call it a description, of Pompey's death and the lesson taught by it. Commencing with the prayer, the psalm reads thus—

"And I saw and entreated the face of the Lord, and said :
Enough, O Lord, hath Thine hand been heavy upon
Jerusalem in bringing in the heathen ;

close of the American hymnals a selection of doxologies to be used after the various hymns therein contained. But whereas our method of hymn-singing requires us to use different doxologies for different metres, and hence to print a number of variant forms of the doxology at the close of our hymnals, their metres and their method of singing rendered it possible to sing the same doxology to every psalm, and hence only one doxology had to be provided at the close of their hymn-books.

But not only did the Jewish Church have the same method of using doxologies which we now have, and which indeed we borrowed from them, it had also the same method of using the amen and the hallelujah. So at the close of the chant to which I have already referred in 1 Chronicles xvi., we are told that "all the people said, Amen, and Hallelujah"; and at the close of Psalm cxi. there is a rubric, unfortunately printed in both our Bibles and Prayer Books as part of the psalm itself, to this effect, "And let all the people say, Amen, Hallelujah." It was the practice, in other words, at the close of the doxology to respond, "Amen." This was also the practice after prayers, as we know, and the Christians adopted that practice from the Jews. It was also, as the cases just cited and others show, the practice after doxologies, and, therefore, in placing an amen at the end of the *Gloria Patri*, the Christians were but copying the old Hebrew use. So also when after some of our praise hymns, especially in the Easter season, we sing "Hallelujah," we are but copying the old Jewish use again. In fact, the *amens* and *hallelujahs* in the Psalter are not original parts of the psalms with which they are connected, but liturgical directions, if I may so express it, like the *amens* which we sing at the close of our hymns.

To sum up, the Jews had a daily Psalter, arranged according to the week, not the month. They had special psalms for special festivals. They composed anthems by divisions and combinations of the psalms, as well as by new compositions. They sang a doxology at the close of each selection of psalms used in a service and at the close of anthems. They made

use at the close of the doxology of the response, Amen. They used liturgically, sometimes at the close of their hymns and sometimes at the beginning, the ascription of praise, Hallelujah.

When the Christian Church was founded the Psalter became the hymn-book of the Christians as it had been of the Jews, and the early Christians not only continued to use the ancient Psalter, but also adopted its spirit and began to compose new psalms, as the Jews had done before them. For while the Psalter as we have it was closed about one hundred and fifty years before Christ, the Jews after this date still continued to compose psalms on the ancient models, which, if they were not adopted into the canonical hymn-book, that is, the Psalter, were, nevertheless, used by pious Jews for purposes of sacred song. One considerable collection of this sort, composed by Pharisees some forty years or so before the birth of our Lord, is still extant, being generally known as the "Psalms of Solomon." These Psalms, as we have them, are written in Greek, but are supposed to be translated from a Hebrew original. They illustrate the development of Jewish thought and belief, particularly with regard to the coming of the expected Messiah, between the close of the Old Testament canon and the birth of Jesus. As an example of the contents of these psalms, let me quote a part of the second psalm, in which allusion is made to the death of Pompey. After picturing the misery and degradation of Jerusalem through the wickedness of her own children, culminating in the occupation of the city by Pompey the Great and the Romans and the profanation of the Temple itself, the psalm passes into a prayer to God for deliverance and vengeance, followed by a triumphant description, if we may call it a description, of Pompey's death and the lesson taught by it. Commencing with the prayer, the psalm reads thus—

"And I saw and entreated the face of the Lord, and said :
Enough, O Lord, hath Thine hand been heavy upon
Jerusalem in bringing in the heathen ;

For they mocked and spared not, in wrath and anger with vengeance ;

And they will make an end, if Thou, Lord, rebuke them not in Thy wrath.

For not in zeal have they done it, but in their own lust,
To pour out their wrath upon us in rapine.

Tarry not, O God, to requite upon their heads,
To turn the pride of the dragon to dishonour.

And whiles I prayed God showed me that proud one (Pompey), pierced on the coasts of Egypt, abased below the least on earth and sea ; his body, corrupted on the waves, in great contempt, and none burying. For He abased him in dishonour.

He considered not that he was man, and his latter end he observed not.

He said : I will be lord of earth and sea ;

And perceived not that God is great ;

He is king upon the heavens, and judgeth kings and rulers ;

Lifting me unto glory, but laying low the proud in everlasting destruction in dishonour, because they knew Him not.

And now see, ye grandees of earth, the judgment of the Lord, that He is a great and righteous King, judging all that is under heaven. Bless God, ye that fear the Lord with understanding. For the mercy of the Lord is on them that fear Him, with judgment to divide between the righteous and the sinner, to recompense sinners for ever according to their works, and to show mercy to the righteous for the oppression of the sinner, and to recompense to the sinner what he did to the righteous. For the Lord is gracious to them that call upon Him in patience, to deal according to His mercy with His own, that they may stand for ever before Him in strength. Blessed be the Lord for ever in the presence of His servants."

I am not at all sure, by the way, that this psalm does not give us an example among the Jews of something which we find in existence among the Christians from a very early period, certainly, if not from the beginning, namely, of inter-

spersing verses of prose and psalmody, the same thing in the small which is done in the large in our Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, where we have lessons, psalms, and chants combined, which is a modification of the use existing at the Reformation.

And now to pass on from the psalmody of the Jews to that of the Christians, the Gospel according to St. Luke gives us several specimens of psalms composed by the early Christians on ancient models: the beautiful Magnificat, "My soul doth magnify the Lord"; the Nunc Dimittis, "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace"; the angelic hymn, "Glory to God in the highest"; and the Benedictus, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel." We have also outside of the Bible fragments of early Christian psalms and odes, some gnostic, some orthodox, composed on psalm models. Here is one example from some odes preserved to us in Coptic sources—

"I will confess to Thee, O Lord, that Thou art my God.

Desert me not, O Lord, for Thou art my hope.

Thou hast given me Thy judgment freely, and I am guarded by Thee.

Let them that pursue me fall and see me not.

Let black clouds and mists of the air cover their eyes.

Let them be darkened, and not see the light, nor ever seize me.

Let their device be turned to weakness, and what they devised return upon their own head.

They planned a plan, and let it not happen unto them.

The mighty have conquered them, and what they prepared has fallen out ill for them.

But my hope is on the Lord, and I will not fear, for Thou art my God and my saviour."

It is evident that in the first Christian centuries the Psalter was a living force, and the spirit of psalmody not yet extinct, even though all the psalms of that date preserved to us are not of the highest poetical order.

We have no liturgies from these earliest Christian centuries

to show us in detail how the Psalter was used in the churches at that time, but only occasional hints, from which we learn something of the way in which the liturgies that we find in existence at a later date must have been built up. In the Jewish synagogue services there had been Scripture readings, psalms, prayers, and versicles, or litanies, taken largely from the Bible. Among these latter was a synagogue litany, or responsive prayer, adapted from Psalm li. Out of this Jewish litany the Christians made that universal and most ancient litany of the Christian Church, the *Kyrie Eleison*—

“Lord, have mercy upon us.
Christ, have mercy upon us.
Lord, have mercy upon us.”

Similarly, we have reason to believe, the whole Christian liturgy and ritual grew out of the Jewish. In the use of the Psalter this is pre-eminently true. At the earliest date of which we have knowledge we find that the Psalter was appointed to be sung in the Christian churches very much as it had been sung by the Jews. There was a special psalm appointed for each day of the week, a song of gladness for the first day, and a song of sorrow and mourning for the sixth day. This followed naturally from the adoption of the seven days' week from the Jews. The first day was set apart for special religious services, as the seventh day had been among the Jews; at the same time, the seventh day preserved its name and to some extent its character as the Sabbath, being observed as a day of rest. As the Jews had observed two days of fasting in the week, the second and the fifth, so the Christians also appointed two days of fasting, the fourth and the sixth. Of these two days the sixth, Friday, was chosen because it was the day on which the Lord was crucified; the fourth, Wednesday, was chosen largely, if not altogether, so that the Christians might fast on a different day from the Jews, as we learn from various early references. Having thus the Jewish system of the week, with its special feasts and fasts for special days, it was natural to adopt the Jewish system of special psalms for each day of the week. The

Jewish practice of appointing special psalms for the great festivals was also followed, it would appear ; for the Christians early commenced to celebrate the great events of Christian life and work by annual fasts and feasts, in this respect also patterning, especially at the outset, upon Jewish practice.

As far as we can learn, then, the Christians at first followed the Jewish method of using the Psalter almost, if not quite, in its entirety. Regular psalms or selections of psalms were appointed for the days of the week and the great feasts. In the service one psalm, or a portion of a psalm, or an anthem made out of sections of psalms, was sung, or, perhaps, on some special occasion, several psalms were united to form a selection and sung over one doxology. At the end of each selection, whether composed of one psalm, a portion of a psalm, or a group of psalms, a doxology was sung, after the Jewish custom. So universal did this use of doxologies soon become that at a very early date a doxology was added even to the Lord's Prayer, and many of the manuscripts of St. Matthew's Gospel give that doxology as though it were a part of the prayer itself. The words of our Lord really end with "deliver us from evil," as we use the prayer in the Litany, before the Communion service, and in the Baptismal office ; the remainder of the prayer, as we frequently use it, "for Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, for ever and ever," is the doxology, to which is added an "Amen," according to the liturgical use with all forms of prayer and praise.

It is in the fourth and fifth centuries after Christ that we find liturgies beginning to assume definite and fixed forms. In the Western Church St. Ambrose, in the Eastern St. Basil, were great liturgy makers. By this time the Bible had ceased to be the live book which it had been to the earlier Christians, and was beginning to receive that mechanical treatment which characterised the dark and middle ages, and in consequence of which it finally became for a time almost a lost writing. But with the lack of comprehension of the sense of Scriptures there went hand in hand an increased reverence for the name and form, so that the recitation of Bible words came to be

regarded as in itself meritorious. This showed itself most of all in the treatment of the Psalter, which was best adapted of all parts of Scripture to memorising, and had from the beginning been memorised more freely than other portions of the Bible. Indeed, we are told that not only at this time, but even earlier, it was not uncommon to find devout laymen who could recite the Psalter through from the beginning to the end, and that children began their study of the Bible with the Psalter. As used in the Church, we find already some slight distinctions between Eastern and Western use. The Eastern Church had, on the whole, clung more closely than the Western to the Jewish and earlier Christian method of singing the Psalter. Doxologies were used only at the end of each selection of psalms, and not at the end of each individual psalm. In the Western Church, on the other hand, it had already become the custom to put a doxology after everything, and accordingly almost every individual psalm used in the service was followed by a doxology, no matter how many psalms might follow one another. In the Eastern Church the early practice of selections, adaptations, the use of parts of psalms, and the like, was still to some extent retained. In the Western Church the psalms, as is indicated, among other things, by the use of the doxology just referred to, had come to be treated as individual wholes, which it was not allowable to modify. The Western Church had also developed more fully, it would appear, the idea of using the psalms consecutively in the order in which they chance to stand in the Psalter.

In both Eastern and Western churches there had grown up the practice of interspersing antiphons or anthems through the psalm and Scripture readings. The intention of this was to glorify the Word of God. The effect of it was to render that Word unintelligible. The practice increased with the increasing ignorance of the true contents of the Bible, until at last in the Latin Church, at the period of its densest ignorance, it was the custom to sing an antiphon after each verse of each psalm. This naturally increased enormously the length of the services, and as the number of psalms used in each service

was continually on the increase, owing to the idea that there was a merit in saying as much of the Psalter as possible, the practice finally cut its own throat. Imagine eighteen psalms appointed for one service, and then more than doubled in length by the insertion of an antiphon after each several psalm verse, and a *Gloria* after each psalm! When this point was reached human endurance was taxed beyond its possibilities, and a reform took place, one part of which was the omission of the antiphons.

But I am forestalling myself. It is, of course, with the use of the Latin Church that we are particularly concerned, since it is from this that the Anglican use was derived. It was the predominance of monasticism and the development of the hour services which brought about the use of the Psalter which we have just noticed. In those services it finally became the rule to sing the whole Psalter through each week, and sometimes more frequently. About twelve psalms, increasing at one time to eighteen, as noted above, were appointed for one selection, with antiphons interspersed and the *Gloria* after each psalm. In the recitation of the Psalter, as in the use of prayer, the mechanical idea prevailed. There was a virtue in the mere repetition of the words, and to sing the whole Psalter through each week had a value in itself quite apart from any intelligent comprehension of the service rendered, or any intelligent participation in that service. Nevertheless, the old practice of selections for special festivals so far prevailed that the psalms were not rearranged altogether according to the order of their position in the Psalter. So the fourth psalm, for instance, which is an evening hymn, was recognised as such, and appointed to be used at evening service, while the third psalm, which is the corresponding morning hymn, was appointed for the morning. So also the ninety-fifth psalm was removed altogether from the regular course and treated as an introduction to the entire service of psalmody for the day, a use which seems to have descended from the earliest days of the Church. Again, psalms like the fifty-first were appointed for the fasting-days and seasons. As

the number of saints' days and the observance of those days increased, so the system of selections was developed, until at last it practically took the place of the regular daily Psalter in the monastic services. We have seen the inordinate length of the Psalter as appointed for daily use; the selections appointed for special days were much shorter, and there was therefore a practical advantage in substituting these selections for the daily use.

It would be impossible in the space of this chapter to point out the various uses of the Latin Church at various times and in various places, and the somewhat conflicting commands of various popes regarding those uses. Suffice it to say that at the time of the Reformation in England the Psalter was theoretically sung through each week in order, except only such psalms of special use as the fourth, fifty-first, ninety-fifth, etc., which were used many times over; but practically this arrangement according to the days of the week had given way to the selections appointed for special days. Actually the psalms were not sung through each week, but only about two-thirds of them were in use, selected and arranged in services according to their supposed appropriateness to the occasions to be celebrated.

It was the services of the hours which formed the basis on which the Morning and Evening Prayer of the English Prayer Book were modelled. We have already seen the conservatism with which the Psalms were treated in the matter of translation, namely, that the Psalter was practically translated from the Latin and not from the Hebrew, and that the Latin translation from which it was translated was in its turn not a translation from the Hebrew, but from the Greek. The same conservatism showed itself in a slightly different form in the arrangement of the Psalms for service use. The Reformers adopted the theory of the mediæval Roman use, that the whole Psalter should be sung through in order within a stated time, and seem to have regarded all deviations from the regular order through the use of selections for holy days, which, as we have seen, had practically taken the place of the

use according to the day, as an abuse which must be corrected. At first sight it is hard to understand how they could have adopted as something essential an idea so mechanical and so alien to the practice of the early Church. Partly, doubtless, their attitude was due to inherited prejudice and the force of custom, for the most independent and even the most radical of men are, after all, swayed in the general conduct of their lives and even in the opinions which they hold more by custom and inheritance than by pure reason. The use of the whole Psalter, and not merely a part of it, as in the use of the selections, had been the cry of the reformers within the Roman Church against those who looked only for that which was the more convenient and the easier, and the English Reformers inherited those views by virtue of being reformers. But further than this, the Reformers stood for the study and use by the people of the whole Bible, and not merely of selected portions, and in the matter of the Psalms it doubtless seemed to them desirable that the whole book should in some way be put in the mouth of the people. No other way was so well adapted to make them familiar with the whole Psalter as to order it to be read through in order.

But in actual practice it was impossible to sing the Psalter through once a week, unless people gave up their business, shut themselves up in monasteries, and devoted themselves to that sort of thing. Consequently, in order to carry out the comparatively recent theory of saying through the whole Psalter in order from beginning to end, they were compelled to abandon the ancient and universal plan of the arrangement of psalms according to a weekly cycle. For the ancient and time-honoured weekly cycle which the Christian Church had inherited from the Jews, and which prevailed in every branch of the Christian Church, east and west alike, they substituted a brand-new monthly arrangement, a thing hitherto unknown in Christendom. This monthly arrangement, moreover, assumed a form far stiffer in its adherence to the order of the psalms in the Psalter—which is in the main a haphazard arrangement as far as subjects are concerned, depending

chiefly on the date of composition of the psalm or its adoption into the Psalter—than any arrangement heretofore adopted. It is true that selections were retained for a few of the greatest feasts of the Church, but for all the other days of the year, Sundays and week-days alike, they ordered that the psalms should be said in rotation, with no reference whatsoever to the Church seasons or the teaching of the day. Friday psalms might fall on Sunday, and Sunday psalms on Friday ; henceforth all was to be determined by chance. The important thing was to have the Psalter said ; the sense of the psalms was a very secondary matter. Accordingly the Psalter was divided into sixty sections, as nearly equal as they could be made without dividing individual psalms other than Psalm cxix. These divisions were allotted in the order in which they came to the days of the month, two consecutive divisions being assigned to each day, one for the morning and one for the evening. And so important did the matter of the division of the psalms into exactly equal portions and their arrangement for consecutive use according to the days of the month appear, that the Reformers could not even consider the possibility of assigning an evening hymn to the evening rather than to the morning. Psalm iv. chanced to fall in the equal portion which had been cut off for the first morning, and, therefore, in the morning it must be sung. Similarly the fact that certain psalms had long been appropriated to special use as chants, like the *Venite*, Psalm xcv., did not prevent them from ordering that those chants should also be sung as psalms in the regular sections of the Psalter appointed for the thirty mornings and the thirty evenings of the month. Ruthless uniformity was to be henceforth the rule.

The English Reformers, moreover, had small conception of the Psalms as hymns or songs ; to them they were a certain section of the Bible, the same as every other section, being, so to speak, neither prose nor verse, but Bible. In the first Prayer Book, of 1549, we read this complaint : “Notwithstanding that the ancient fathers had divided the Psalms into seven portions, whereof every one was called a nocturne,

now of late time a few have been daily said, and the rest daily omitted." And so, as said, they provided that the whole Psalter should be recited in the daily services in the course of the month. By this arrangement five or six psalms on an average were to be recited daily, and as the Sundays fall on different days each month, so the Sunday churchgoer, provided always that he went to church twice each Sunday, would in course of time recite the whole Psalter. The only modification of this system of monthly repetition according to the days of the month was, as already noted, the appointment of special psalms for Christmas, Easter, Ascension Day, and Whit Sunday. The Psalter was not printed in this Prayer Book, but a calendar for the reading of the Psalms was placed immediately before the calendar for the reading of the rest of the Scriptures. It was intended that the whole Bible should be read through in the churches, and the Psalter was ordered to be read likewise. Apparently it was not regarded as a hymn-book in this use. On the other hand, in the Prayer Book of 1549 there are printed along with the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, Introits, differing for each Sunday or feast day, each introit consisting of one psalm. In this use the psalms are treated as hymns, and in reality this use of psalms as introits in the Prayer Book of 1549 is much more in keeping with the original intention and purpose of the Psalter, and with its use in the early Church, than is the calendar use, formulated for the first time in the same Prayer Book, by which the Psalter is ordered to be read through once in each month.

The second Prayer Book of Edward VI., the Prayer Book of 1552, omitted the introits, and left nothing behind but the calendar use. It may be said that this method of using the Psalter is characteristic of the tendency manifested at this period, to exalt the Bible, not by a study and use of its contents in the spirit in which it was composed, but mechanically, as though it were a thing divine in its outward form, in its letter. In keeping with this general method of treatment we may also observe that where psalms are to be used as

chants a whole psalm is invariably used; never mind how ill adapted individual verses of the psalms may be, they are never omitted; nor are portions of one psalm added to another, practices common in the early Church, when both of these methods were freely used for the purpose of obtaining chants and anthems thoroughly adapted to the occasion. The inviolability and separateness of the individual psalms was also further emphasised by the adoption of the later Western use of singing the *Gloria* after each psalm, as over against the earlier Eastern use of a doxology only after each selection or group of psalms. In the Prayer Book of 1559 three psalms for chant use are added as alternates in Morning and Evening Prayer. The succeeding editions of the Prayer Book retain the calendar use of the Psalter unchanged, and in general the use of the same psalms as chants, with, however, some slight variations. So, for example, in the Prayer Book of 1637, that of Laud and Charles I., the beautiful twenty-third psalm is substituted for the *Benedicite* as the alternate to the *Te Deum* in Morning Prayer. It was in 1662 that the English Prayer Book assumed its final form. At that time Psalms xxxix. and xc. were added to the burial service, which had been without any psalmody whatever since the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., which appointed for the burial service Psalms cxvi., cxlvi., and cxxxix. In the Prayer Book of 1662 we find also special psalms provided for Ash Wednesday and Good Friday, making six days instead of four on which the regular monthly order has to be broken. It is in this Prayer Book also that the Psalter first appears within the covers. It became necessary at this time to print it as a part of the Prayer Book, because while heretofore the translation of the Great Bible had been in use for all reading of the Scriptures in church services, from this time forward it was provided that the King James Version should be substituted, except only in the Psalter, where the old version was to be retained for reasons already noticed. The King James Bible accordingly became the Church Bible, and the Great Bible passed out of use, becoming speedily obsolete. As a mere matter of

practical convenience, therefore, it was necessary to print the Psalter in the Prayer Book, in order that it might be accessible to the people, who could no longer find it in their Bibles.

And now, having traced the arrangement of the Psalter in the Anglican use down to its final appearance in the Prayer Book of 1662, let us examine briefly the method in which the psalms are arranged for daily use in the English Prayer Book and some of the most glaring of the incongruities resulting therefrom. It has already been pointed out that the Psalter was divided by the English Reformers into equal sections for use in Morning and Evening Prayer. As there are thirty days to a month, these sections consequently number sixty, and as there are one hundred and fifty psalms, on an average two and a half psalms would be appointed for use each morning and the same number each evening; but, as the psalms are very uneven in length and the object was to make the appointed portions as nearly as possible equal, actually as many as five or six short psalms were sometimes allotted to one portion, whereas, on the other hand, Psalm cxix., on account of its length, was divided up and distributed over several days.

The only effort that was made in the arrangement of the Anglican Psalter was to have the appointed portions as nearly equal as might be without dividing any psalm other than cxix. Accordingly, in the morning Psalter for the first day, we have five psalms appointed to be used, which, as anyone will see who reads them, have no connexion in thought or outward form with one another, except only that they are psalms. The effect to one who sings the psalms with some conception of their sense and purpose is much the same as if one were to make a selection of the first five hymns in the Hymnal (American) according to the index of first lines, namely, "A charge to keep I have," "A few more years shall roll," "A tower of strength our God," "Abide with me, fast falls the eventide," "Above the clear blue sky," and sing them through in this chance order, with only a doxology between, as the praise

service in Morning Prayer. This illustration is all the more pertinent, because the fourth of the five psalms appointed for the Morning Prayer of the first day is an evening hymn, the use of which in Morning Prayer is precisely as intelligent as would be the use of "Abide with me, fast falls the eventide" in the same place. The Psalter for that evening is likewise infelicitous in arrangement. Psalms vi. and vii., with which it begins, are supplicatory, trustful petitions. These two would in themselves form an excellent selection, but Psalm viii. ruins the harmony of thought. It is a grand hymn of praise to the Creator of Heaven; and to sing these three together as a single act of praise, is, to illustrate once more from the American Hymnal, as though "Blest be the tie that binds," "Father, whate'er of earthly bliss," and "All hail the power of Jesus' Name," were made into one selection and ordered to be sung together.

Turn now to the Psalter for the fourth day, Morning Prayer. This begins with a beautiful composite psalm, the nineteenth. Now, Psalm xix. is a selection in itself, and well illustrates the method of composing selections of psalms or anthems for worship among the Jews. The first part, earlier in date by some centuries than the second, is a short metre psalm, praising God the Creator as He manifests Himself in the daily course of the sun. The second part is a later psalm, which has been added to the first. It is in long metre, of the so-called *kinah* or lament verse, like the metre of Lamentations, and is a hymn of praise to God the Law Giver as He manifests Himself in His wonderful and glorious Law. The connexion of thought between the two parts is manifest and most suggestive, and the marked difference of metre adds to the grandeur of the composition by preserving and emphasising the integrity of each part. The whole forms one of the noblest anthems of the Psalter, and is a complete and well-rounded act of worship in itself. But in the Psalter for the fourth day, Morning Prayer, this magnificent anthem has hung on to it two battle hymns, the one, Psalm xx., a petition for the triumph of the king in war, the other, Psalm xxi., a *Te Deum* after victory.

The two psalms are fine in themselves, but sung together with the nineteenth as one selection or anthem, for that is about what a selection of psalms amounts to when sung, each destroys the effect of the other, because there is absolutely no connexion in thought between them. They should form two separate selections. The Psalter for the same evening is equally unhappy, Psalm xxii. being an anguished cry out of suffering, appropriate to such a day as Good Friday, for which it was the introit in the Prayer Book of 1549, while Psalm xxiii. is a gentle, sweet, peaceful song of the man at rest in the bosom of God. They go together in precisely the same way that "Weary of earth, and laden with my sin," and "Jesus, tender shepherd, hear me," go together.

The Psalter for the fifth morning is equally objectionable from an artistic and liturgical point of view. Psalm xxiv. is a noble processional hymn, adapted to services of dedication. Psalm xxvi. is an introit prepared for the approach to the altar, and might, therefore, be associated with Psalm xxiv. in one selection. But the two are separated by Psalm xxv., which is a deeply penitential hymn of the nation, or community, or individual in distress, calling on God to be mindful of His tender mercies and loving-kindnesses of old and turn again and be gracious. How would it sound to combine into one anthem the three hymns, "Onward, Christian soldiers," "Saviour, when in dust to Thee," and "The Church's one foundation"? It is substantially the same thing which has been done in the Psalter for the fifth morning.

In the Psalter for the eighth evening Psalm xli. is used, with the doxology of the first book attached to it, as though it were a component part of the psalm. I have already pointed out that verse 13 of this psalm as printed in our Prayer Books: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; world without end. Amen," is no part of the psalm whatever, but a doxology written after all hymns in the first book, to be sung with any of them, or with any selection of them in worship. Following Psalm xli., the closing psalm of the first book, in the Psalter for the eighth evening are Psalms xlvi.

and xlivi. I have already pointed out what is universally acknowledged, that these two psalms constitute together one song. This song consists of three stanzas, each stanza ending with the same refrain (curiously differentiated in our Prayer Book translation) : "Why art thou so heavy, O my soul? And why art thou so disquieted within me? O put thy trust in God: For I will yet give Him thanks, which is the help of my countenance and my God." These three stanzas, composing as they do one poem, should be treated either as three psalms or as one, and not as two, that arrangement in the Hebrew Psalter being a mere accident. Moreover, this psalm, "Like as the hart," consisting of Psalms xlvi. and xlivi., has no connexion in thought whatsoever with Psalm xli., and should rather constitute a selection by itself.

The Psalter for the ninth morning is singularly infelicitous. Psalm xlvi., the first in the Psalter appointed for that day, is itself a composite psalm. The first part, verses 1-9, is a psalm of victory, describing what great things God has done for His people. The end of this original poem is marked in the Hebrew by a *Selah*. To this earlier triumph-song was added later, in a period of sore distress, a piteous cry to God to wake out of sleep and deliver His people. The whole is a grand anthem, and would make a sufficient selection in itself, consisting as it does of two songs combined in one. The next psalm in the section appointed for the Psalter for the ninth morning is a marriage hymn, about as inappropriate a companion for Psalm xlvi. as could be found. Psalm xlvi., again, is a psalm of triumph, celebrating God's might in overthrowing the heathen and subduing the earth. It has no appropriateness, in connexion with either Psalm xlvi. or xlvi. To illustrate once more from the hymn-book, the Psalter for the ninth morning is in connexion of thought as though one were to combine together the hymns, "In the hour of trial, Jesus, plead for me," "To Thee, O Father, throned on high, Our marriage hymn we duly sing," and "Thou, God, all glory, honour, power." The Psalter for the ninth evening, if not quite so infelicitous as that for the morning, is, nevertheless,

distinctly incongruous. Psalms xlvi. and xlviii., with which it begins, go well together, both of them being songs of triumph. Psalm xlvi., which, as we have seen, is sadly out of place in the Psalter for the morning, would go admirably with these two psalms. On the other hand, Psalm xlix., which is joined with them in the present arrangement of the Psalter for the ninth evening, is most unfortunately placed. Psalms xlvi. and xlviii. are triumph songs to God as king and conqueror, while Psalm xlix. is a meditative, rather melancholy discussion of the problem of evil. To realise the effect of this try in its place a selection composed of the three hymns, "Hark ! the sound of holy voices," "Ten thousand times ten thousand," and "Whate'er my God ordains is right."

Turning to the fourteenth day, you will find that the two psalms which compose the Psalter appointed for that morning, lxxi. and lxxii., go together about as well as the two hymns, "Saviour, when in dust to Thee" and "All hail the power of Jesus' Name." One is a litany-like lament, and the other a triumphant outburst, a prophetic picture of the Messiah and His kingdom. What are printed as the last two verses of the latter of these psalms might, by the way, be with equal appropriateness attached to the end of any of the psalms from xlvi. to lxxii., or to any selections made from these psalms. Those verses are not part of Psalm lxxii., but a doxology meant to be sung after any psalm of the second book.

In the Psalter for the sixteenth morning we have Psalm lxxix., which is an almost despairing cry for help out of the bitterest distress of persecution, a companion-piece to Psalm lxxiv. This is followed by Psalm lxxx., the song of the ruined vineyard, a prayer for the deliverance of Israel, wasted, devoured, burnt with fire and cut down. While the proper companion-piece of Psalm lxxix. is lxxiv., nevertheless there is no incongruity in the juxtaposition of lxxix. and lxxx. But Psalm lxxxii., which has been joined with these two to compose the Psalter for the sixteenth morning, strikes an entirely different note, quite out of tune with that of those two psalms. It is a "merry song," a "cheerful noise" unto

the "God of our strength." The Psalter for the evening of the same day is equally incongruous, consisting as it does of two psalms, lxxxii. and lxxxiii., telling of God's judgment of the heathen, and two psalms, lxxxiv. and lxxxv., of a totally opposite nature, gentle and peaceful in tone. Of these latter lxxxiv. is a sweet Temple song, "O, how amiable are Thy dwellings," and lxxxv. a soft-toned hymn of thanksgiving to God for deliverance out of captivity. The Psalter for the sixteenth evening should surely have been divided into two sections.

In the Psalter for the seventeenth morning we have three psalms, the first of which is a petition for deliverance out of affliction, and the third, the one utterly despairing song of the Psalter, a cry out of distress, through which glimmers not a single ray of hope. If the first and last of these psalms, lxxxvi. and lxxxviii., might fitly be joined together, certainly Psalm lxxxvii. intervening destroys the connexion of thought and utters an inharmonious note, for it is glad and triumphant. The Psalter for that evening consists of Psalm lxxxix., at the end of which, as though it were part of verse 50 of the psalm, is printed the doxology of the third book: "Praised be the Lord for evermore. Amen, and Amen," which, as already pointed out in the case of the doxologies for the first and second books, belongs as much to any of the psalms preceding it, from lxxiii. onward, as to this psalm.

The Psalter for the twenty-fourth morning consists of Psalms cxvi., cxvii., and cxviii. Psalm cxvii. is in reality a doxology, and consists of but two verses. Everyone must have felt the awkwardness of singing a *Gloria Patri* both before and after this short psalm, which is itself a doxology. On the other hand, if Psalms cxvi. and cxvii. alone constituted this Psalter, what a grand close Psalm cxvii. would make, provided the *Gloria Patri* were not sung between the two, but only at the close of both! This psalm might also be used after several of the preceding psalms, after the manner in which it seems to have been used among the Hebrews. Psalm cxviii., which is part of this Psalter, would be far more effective as a selection

by itself. It is probably, on the whole, the most effective processional in the whole Book of Psalms.

The Psalter for the twenty-eighth evening is one of those offensively incongruous arrangements which force themselves on the attention. Psalms cxxxvi. and cxxxviii. are glad triumphant hymns; Psalm cxxxvii., which intervenes between the two, is a very sad and very beautiful lamentation of the captives sitting down and weeping by the waters of Babylon. The effect of the combination on the mind of anyone who considers at all what are the words which he is singing is the same as it would be if he were to hear sung together as one whole the hymns, "Hark! the herald angels sing," "Forty days and forty nights," and "Holy, Holy, Holy! Lord God Almighty."

These notes on the infelicities of the Anglican arrangement of singing the psalms in equal portions, according as they happen to come, are very incomplete, only a few of the most glaring cases having been selected for comment; but these are probably enough to show that this arrangement is capable of improvement.

Another incongruity often results from this arrangement; namely, a want of harmony between the Psalter and the remainder of the service. The Anglican Psalter is arranged according to the days of the month, and almost entirely ignores the ecclesiastical year, recognising by separate selections only Christmas, Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, Easter Day, Ascension Day, and Whit Sunday. But the services of the Church in every other particular are arranged according to the Church Year. We have a special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for each Sunday, and the Lessons from both Old and New Testament are very carefully chosen on the same system, with a view to enforcing from as many sides as possible the lesson of the day. That lesson may be of the most joyful and triumphant character, as in the Easter season, or in the octave of Christmas, or on Trinity Sunday, in which case the Epistle and Gospel, the Lessons for the day, and even the hymns and anthems chosen to be sung, are of the same character; but

the day of the month may be the fourth, in which case, according to the Anglican arrangement, the Good Friday psalm, "My God, my God, look Thou upon me," must be sung in the Psalter; or the tenth, and the *Miserere* must be used. Or, *vice versâ*, you may be in the midst of Passion week, where the whole tone of the services is meant to be that of the *Miserere*, and lo and behold! it is the thirtieth day of the month, and the Psalter bursts out in a veritable pæan of mirth and gladness.

There is another class of incongruities, which is the result of the failure to appreciate the meaning of the psalms and of a worship of the letter, which compelled the use of each psalm just as it stood without the change of one jot or tittle. It is that spirit which shows itself in the treatment of Psalm xc., the *Venite*, which is sung every day of the year. It might be supposed that this was quite enough use for this psalm, and it was held to be enough in all uses before the Anglican; but, apparently on the theory that there is some virtue in its repetition in course immediately after Psalm xciv. and immediately before Psalm xcvi., the Anglican Reformers directed that, after being used as a chant every other day, on the nineteenth day it should be said in course with the other psalms. The same was done with the other canticles. Never mind how frequently they may be used as canticles, they must also be used in course in the Psalter, as though there were some special virtue in repeating them in their order of number as they happen to stand in the Psalter. This curious double use is, I believe, exclusively Anglican. Similarly, psalms which appear twice in the Psalter are sung twice over during the month, Psalm xiv. being sung in the Psalter for the second morning, and then again as Psalm liii. in the Psalter for the tenth evening; while Psalm lxx., which has already appeared as verses 16-21 of Psalm xl. and been sung in the Psalter for the eighth morning, is sung a second time in the Psalter for the thirteenth evening. Psalm cviii., which forms part of the Psalter for the twenty-second evening, is an anthem composed of verses 8-12 of Psalm lvii., and verses 5-12 of Psalm ix.,

and had, therefore, been already sung in the Psalters for the eleventh morning and evening respectively. It may be added, however, that in the case of all these duplicates the two translations in the Anglican Psalter are so different that they may well pass for different psalms.

A more serious result of the failure to understand the Psalter on the part of the English Reformers is the treatment of rubrics and the like as parts of the psalms in which they occur. We have already seen the manner in which the doxologies of the first, second, and third books have been attached to the individual psalms which they happen to follow, as though they were a component part of those psalms. The doxology of the fourth book will be found at the close of Psalm cvi. It is identical with the doxology at the close of the first book, although in the Prayer Book Psalter that identity is obscured by a difference of translation. It seems to have been the commonest form of doxology, and we find it used again at the close of the dedicatory psalm in 1 Chronicles xvi. 36, where we are also told that "all the people said, *Amen.*" As written at the close of Psalm xli., the *Amen* is printed immediately after the doxology. As written at the close of Psalm cvi., the *Amen* is preceded by the rubric, "and let all the people say." In the Psalter as arranged for the Prayer Book the doxology is printed as part of Psalm cvi., and the rubric is incorporated with the doxology, so that we sing psalm, doxology, rubric, and *Amen* all in one breath as it were. It seems scarcely desirable to chant the rubrics in our churches. Certainly we should never think of commencing the *Venite* by singing, "Then shall be said or sung this Psalm following"; and there is no more reason for prefacing the *Amen* at the close of this doxology with the rubric, "Let all the people say."

There is a somewhat similar rubric in Psalm cxviii., which forms part of the Psalter for the twenty-fourth morning, according to the Anglican arrangement. As already pointed out, this is a processional hymn, intended for use at some temple service and sacrifice. In the second half of verse 27,

after the altar has been reached and the priest is ready to proceed to the sacrifice, following the words, "God is the Lord Who hath showed us light," comes a rubric, directing that at this point the sacrifice should be bound with cords to the horns of the altar. In the original this rubric is the barest prose. In the Prayer Book version it has been translated so as to have some resemblance to poetry, and its true nature being thus obscured, it was printed and sung as part of the psalm. To one who follows the sense the effect is much as though the rubrics by the side of the prayer of Consecration in the Communion service were to be recited as component parts of that prayer.

But perhaps the most curious case of printing the rubrics and similar directions as part of the psalm occurs in Psalm lxviii., which forms the Psalter for the thirteenth morning. It is a grand psalm, taken as a whole, but I think that everyone must have felt that there are verses in it which are quite unintelligible to him. Especially is this true with verses 12, 13, and 14, which appear to have no connexion with one another or with the remainder of the psalm. Verse 11 reads: "The Lord gave the word : great was the company of the preachers." The verses following this read: "Kings with their armies did flee, and were discomfited : and they of the household divided the spoil. Though ye have lien among the pots, yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove : that is covered with silver wings, and her feathers like gold. When the Almighty scattered kings for their sake : then were they as white as snow in Salmon." Now while the individual clauses in these three verses make sense, each for itself as far as it goes, they do not make sense taken together, and quite manifestly have no connexion with one another in thought. In point of fact, they are the headlines of hymns. The action of the psalm is dramatic. It is a processional, and the first part, the first ten verses, is a description of God's victorious procession out of Egypt through the wilderness, full of miraculous mercies toward His people, ending with the grant to them of the land of Canaan as their inheritance. Then He

bids the company of women, or, as the Prayer Book version has it, "preachers," to celebrate in song what He has done. The verses following are the first lines of the songs which they sing, and to sing them as the consecutive and connected verses of a psalm is precisely as it would be to make such a hymn verse as this—

"My God, permit me not to be."
"Nearer, my God, to Thee."
"Hail the day that sees Him rise."
"From all that dwell below the skies."

I think it must be clear to every one that the Anglican Reformers were unfortunately mechanical in their treatment of the Psalter. If they had not been bound by the false idea of preserving for service use, as well as in the Bible, each psalm in its integrity, they might have adopted the plan of omitting verses not intelligible, which would have been a natural sequence to their own principle that the services should be in "a tongue understood of the people." This certainly would have been in accordance with ancient and Catholic use, which they sought to substitute in other matters for the mediæval use of Rome. Indeed, had they been guided in this regard by primitive use, they might have modified the *Venite*, the *Benedicite*, and other chants by the omission of local and distinctively Jewish references, as was done later in the American Church, thus adapting them more fully to use as Christian hymns. Similarly, they might have modified a few of the psalms of the Psalter in the same manner. So, for example, the *Miserere* (Psalm li.) would gain by the omission of the last two verses, just as the *Venite* of the American Prayer Book has gained by the omission of the last five verses. Still greater would be the gain to Psalm cxxxvii. by the omission of the last three verses, which would indeed restore that psalm to its original and most ancient form.

But in the case of the last three verses of Psalm cxxxvii. there is another question involved in their omission besides the question of unintelligibility or merely local and Jewish allusions. These verses, like verses 23-29 of Psalm lxix.,

verses 1-19 of Psalm cix., and a few other verses scattered here and there through other psalms, are incompatible in their plain sense with the teaching of Christ. There is a certain traditional interpretation of these passages proposed by some of the Church fathers, which explains away the imprecations in a mystical manner. But even granting that this explanation is correct and the plain sense of the words incorrect, it remains a fact that as the words themselves, and not the mystical interpretation of those words, are chanted or recited by the people, they are not adapted to use in the service. It is a poor plan to sing hymns which are unintelligible, and a still poorer plan to sing hymns which must inevitably teach false doctrine to the ordinary man. Our Lord said, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." If we read this to the people once in three months, and every week or two call upon them to sing or recite, without any explanation, such passages as these: "Let them fall from one wickedness to another: and not come into Thy righteousness.

Let them be wiped out of the book of the living: and not be written among the righteous";

"Let him be condemned: and let his prayer be turned into sin.

Let his children be fatherless: and his wife a widow.

Let his children be vagabonds, and beg their bread.

Let there be no man to pity him: nor to have compassion upon his fatherless children.

Let his posterity be destroyed: and in the next generation let his name be clean put out.

Let the wickedness of his fathers be had in remembrance in the sight of the Lord: and let not the sin of his mother be done away.

Let it thus happen from the Lord unto mine enemies";

"O daughter of Babylon, wasted with misery: yea, happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us";

“Blessed shall he be that taketh thy children : and throweth them against the stones”—we shall appear to the average mind to give the preference to the old Jewish doctrine, as the Jews understood and to their misfortune still understand it, following the plain sense of the words of such psalms. In arranging psalms for use in the Church service the rule should have been to omit all passages not evidently in harmony with the morality of the Gospels. The Psalms in their entirety should be printed in the Bible and used as Bible, but when they are to be used as hymns of the Church they should be used in a proper and appropriate form and manner. The Anglican Reformers confounded the two uses in their arrangement of the Psalter.

Having discussed the Anglican Psalter, let us study the development out of that of the American use, and the various changes and proposed changes in the use of the Psalms in that Church. The first practical attempt at a reform of the Anglican Psalter was made by John Wesley, who prepared for his followers, in 1784, a version of “Select Psalms,” arranged, after the pattern of the Anglican Psalter, for a month of thirty days. He did not emancipate himself from the mechanical arrangement according to the order of the psalms in the Psalter, neither did he always display a thorough comprehension of the sense of the individual psalms, so that, for example, he assigns the third Psalm, which is a morning hymn, to the evening ; but his “Select Psalms” are an improvement over the Anglican arrangement, in that a selection was made of those psalms best adapted for the purposes of worship in the Christian Church, the selections were shortened, the primitive practice of adapting the Psalms for use by omissions, and the like, was followed, instead of the stiff Anglican method of singing each psalm precisely as it stands, and particularly all passages objectionable from the standpoint of Christian morality were carefully omitted.

The makers of the American Prayer Book seem to have felt the influence of Wesley’s “Select Psalms.” The Proposed Book, which appeared a couple of years after Wesley’s work, treated

the Psalter in much the same manner as he had done, still clinging to the division into sixty parts, two for each of the thirty days of the month, and arranging the Psalms according to the order in which they happen in the Psalter, but reducing the size of the daily portions, eliminating passages incompatible with the morality of Christ, and asserting the principle of selection. On the whole, the Psalter of the Proposed Book is a slight improvement on the "Select Psalms" of Wesley. Like most of the other novelties of the Proposed Book, this arrangement of the Psalter was not adopted in the American Prayer Book of 1789 and 1792; but certain important changes were made in the line of the reforms proposed by the compilers of that book. The Anglican Psalter was retained just as it stood, so that whoever wished might use it; but it was prefaced by ten selections of psalms. These selections were shorter than the regular Psalter for the day, and were selected with a view to furnishing for all seasons of the Church Year appropriate psalmody in harmony with the other parts of the service, and consistent with itself. By their position before the Psalter, arranged according to the days, these selections were recommended for use in preference to the Psalter for the day. In these selections, following primitive use, the American Church fathers did not hesitate to use portions of psalms as well as entire psalms. They also reverted to primitive use in recommending the use of the *Gloria Patri* only after each selection or group of psalms, allowing, however, as an alternative the later Western practice of singing the *Gloria* after each individual psalm. The former use, it may be said once more, emphasises the idea of the selection of psalms as the unit, each selection being treated as an anthem, while the latter use treats the individual psalm as the unit, and insists, as it were, on its integrity. Further than this, several new canticles were prefixed to the Psalter for optional use on the great feast days, composed after the manner of various primitive models by putting together verses from several psalms. Following the same primitive freedom of treatment, the *Venite* was vastly improved by dropping verses 8-11 of Psalm xcvi.

and substituting therefor a few verses of Psalm xcvi. Similarly the *Benedicite* was improved by the omission of the last verse, which is too local and particularistic for use in a general hymn sung in Christian churches: "O Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, bless ye the Lord; praise Him, and magnify Him for ever." Two new canticles were also added to Evening Prayer, composed out of psalms, but not consisting in either case of the entire psalm: the *Bonum Est*, consisting of the first four verses of Psalm xcii., and the *Benedic Anima Mea*, consisting of the first four and the last three verses of Psalm ciii. (Unfortunately, at the same time, the two Gospel hymns, *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis*, were omitted from Evening Prayer.) A change was also made in the psalmody for the burial service on the same primitive model. The English Prayer Book provided two psalms, xxxix. and xc., each of which, after the Anglican manner, was to be used entire, and each to be followed by the *Gloria*. The American revisers omitted several somewhat irrelevant or inappropriate verses from each psalm, making of the two one anthem, and emphasised the unity of this, as over against the Anglican idea of separate psalms, by placing one *Gloria* at the end of the whole.

I have already consumed so much space that I shall not dare to enter here into the history of the use of the Psalms of David in metre, as appointed to be used from time to time in the American Church. At first a translation of the whole Book of Psalms into metre, Tate and Brady's, was bound up with the Prayer Book and "allowed to be sung in all congregations of the said Church before and after Morning and Evening Prayer, and also before and after sermons, at the discretion of the Minister"; and it was "the duty of every Minister of any Church, either by standing directions, or from time to time, to appoint the portions of Psalms which are to be sung." In 1808 a rubric was adopted providing that one of the metrical psalms should be sung at each service. In 1832 a selection of psalms was substituted for the full translation of the Psalter, and this selection of psalms in metre remained in the Prayer Book until 1871. This use of

metrical psalms in addition to the psalms of the Psalter receives elucidation, if any were wanted, from the authority given in 1785 to the committee appointed to publish the Proposed Book. They were "authorised to publish with the Book of Common Prayer such of the reading and singing Psalms" as they should think proper. The Psalter did not appear to our fathers to be real poetry, adapted to the purpose of singing, and so they felt it necessary to have it translated into poetry for musical use. They meant to read it responsively for edification, because it was the inspired Word of God, but for musical purposes they thought it desirable to have it translated into poetry. They did not appreciate the Psalter, which was precisely the trouble with the English Reformers, and they did not know that it was poetry. I am reminded of the horror with which an American poet, Mrs. Helen Hunt Jackson, once narrated to me a proposition which her publishers had made to her to translate the Book of Ruth into poetry. They were about to issue an illustrated edition of Ruth, and for that purpose wished her to translate it into poetry. "As though my poor doggerel could begin to compare with the magnificent poetry of that book," said she. The trouble with her publishers was that they did not know that it was poetry. The English Reformers were in much the same condition regarding the Psalter, and the American fathers also were somewhat slow to find out that psalms are hymns even if they do not rhyme, and if there are not the same number of syllables in each line.

In 1826 a wise and progressive move was made in General Convention, which, had it been successful, would have done much for the Psalter in bringing us back to a more primitive use. On motion of Bishop Hobart, of New York, the House of Bishops proposed certain resolutions for a permissive shortening of the service, which were adopted by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. The first of these resolutions dealt with the Psalter, and gave the following discretion in regard to its use: "The Minister, instead of reading from the Psalter, as divided for daily morning and

evening prayers, may read one of the selections set out by this Church, or any other Psalm or Psalms, except on those days on which *Proper Psalms* are appointed." Bishop Moore, of Virginia, opposed this and all the proposed changes, on the ground that one innovation would be followed by another, and finally all uniformity of worship be destroyed. This view ultimately prevailed, and the next General Convention dismissed the further consideration of the resolutions passed by its predecessor as inexpedient.

But the need for some changes in the Prayer Book was a real one, and changes could not be staved off for ever by an overtimid conservatism. To be sure, these changes, when they finally came, were not radical, and were extremely small in proportion to the amount of fuss made over them; nevertheless they went in general much further than the changes so earnestly deprecated by Bishop Moore. In the matter of the Psalter, and chants taken from the Psalter, however, the changes in the new American Prayer Book of 1892 are less radical than those proposed by Bishop Hobart, and, indeed, in some respects the changes are rather reactionary than progressive. This is shown in the directions for the use of the *Gloria*. It has been pointed out that in the first American Prayer Book not only was permission given to use the *Gloria* after each selection or group of psalms only, according to the early Eastern use, but that this was given the preference over the later Latin use, adhered to in the Anglican Psalter, of singing the *Gloria* after each individual psalm. In the new American Prayer Book this is reversed, and while permission is still given to use the *Gloria* after the primitive method, preference is given by the rubric to the Latin use of singing it after each several psalm. The principle at stake is well illustrated in the treatment of the Burial Chant in the same Prayer Book. In the old American Prayer Book it was treated as a unit, as one anthem, although composed out of portions of two psalms, and accordingly the *Gloria* was sung only at the close of the whole anthem. In the new Prayer Book it is separated into two parts, according

to the psalms from which it is composed, and the *Gloria* is ordered to be sung after each part, to the serious detriment of its unity as an anthem, but with the result of emphasising the fact that it is not a single psalm in the Bible. The omission of the alternative anthems for special days, composed out of several psalms, points perhaps in the same direction.

In the matter of the use of the Psalter as a whole, the preference given in the old book to the selections of psalms over the Psalter for the day is reversed, and the selections themselves are no longer printed separately, a most efficient and practical way of discouraging their use and bringing them into desuetude, without actually prohibiting them altogether. On the other hand, the number of selections was increased from ten to twenty, and the additional ten selections are on the whole admirable. But the failure to print the selections separately, and the substitution for the separate selections of a calendar by which anyone wishing to use selections may hunt up the proper psalms for himself, much more than counterbalances the increase in the number of the selections from ten to twenty. If the twenty selections were printed separately before the daily Psalter, as the old selections were, the gain for the use of the Psalter would be very considerable. As it is, the practical inconvenience of using them is such that it would have been much better to have left the old ten selections untouched, and the result of the increase in the number of the selections is apt to be the disuse of selections altogether and the complete reversion to the haphazard Anglican method of using the Psalter. The increase of the number of days for which special psalms are appointed from six to sixteen is a decided advance over the old book.

As the new American book stands, then, there is in some particulars an advance over the old book in the use of the Psalms, and in other cases the old book was superior to the new; practically, however, the new book is inferior to the old, owing to the omission of the separate selections.

This was the great practical blunder of the revisers of the American Prayer Book, and this omission more than neutralised all the good that they did in the way of increasing the number of the selections provided for use. Far better have ten selections, and print them before the Psalter, than have twenty selections, indicated only by their numbers, so that it is inconvenient to use them, and so that it shall appear that the recommendation of the Church is to use the Psalter of the day. Further revision of the American book is still needed in the matter of the use of the Psalter. The first and practically the most important thing to do is to have the twenty selections printed out in full before the Psalter as arranged for daily use.

The second step should be, though they might well both be taken together, to pass Bishop Hobart's rubric, mentioned above, which succeeded in passing the General Convention of 1826, only to be defeated in 1829, permitting the minister, where he thinks it desirable, to read instead of the Psalter for the day or one of the appointed selections, "any other Psalm or Psalms, except on those days on which proper Psalms are appointed."

Our object should be to make the Psalter a true hymnal. If it is desirable to have it read in course, that all of it may surely be brought to the ears of the faithful and regular attendants at our Church services some time or other, let it be added to the calendar of Scriptures to be read in church. We already read in that calendar several songs and poems which, among the Jews and in the early Church, and even in the mediaeval Church, were treated as psalmody and sung with or in the place of psalms. There is no reason why psalms should not be read from the lectern as well as such poems as Deuteronomy xxxiii. But when we use the Psalms as psalmody in the Church they should be treated as hymns. They are in reality the grandest collection of hymns ever brought together, the inspired hymn-book of the Jewish Church, and deserve an intelligent use, which shall bring out more fully to the ordinary man their marvellous beauty.

and comprehensiveness. The mechanical prayer-wheel system, by which semi-daily mathematically measured sections are turned off without the slightest regard to sense, is a fatal obstacle to their intelligent comprehension. They should be treated with some of that freedom and realisation of their living sense which characterise the Jewish and the early Christian use.

PART IV

ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE BIBLE

CHAPTER X

A REVIEW OF RESULTS

IN a former chapter I have spoken of archæological discoveries as one of the great factors in the development of Biblical Criticism within the last half-century. In this and the succeeding chapters I propose to treat (1) the general results of archæological research, and (2) some special applications of archæology to the solution of Bible problems.

There is an inclination on the part of some to set archæology over against Higher Criticism, as though it were a separate discipline, and not only separate from, but also opposed to the Higher Criticism. In reality Higher Criticism includes in itself the use of archæology. Given a text determined by the Lower Criticism, it is the business of Higher Criticism to interpret that text upon its literary side; to determine, that is, questions of date, authorship, method of composition, and the like. To determine these questions it draws upon all accessible material, and consequently upon archæological material.

But it is true that there has been a tendency on the part of Old Testament students to develop, not Higher Criticism, but close criticism of the Old Testament to an extreme degree, depending unduly on subjective data, that is, on the impression made upon the mind of the critic by the style, the thought, the doctrine, and the like. While the study of style and the study of the development of thought are necessary parts of the historical and literary criticism of any work, and while there is a science of the study of these, so that it is quite possible to say that such and such a thing

could not have been written in such and such a period, because its style and language belong clearly to such and such another period, or because its conceptions in regard to certain matters are such as do not appear before or after such and such a period, nevertheless, it is also true that there is a large subjective element in this discipline, and it is necessary to check the results obtained through it by data of a more objective character.

Comparing the present position of Old Testament criticism with the criticism of the Roman, Greek, Indian, and Persian literary remains, we find that there has been a reaction in those fields against the use of such subjective evidence alone and an inclination to return, in regard to questions of date and of authorship, to a more conservative position, as a result largely of archæological discoveries. It is not so long since the divisive theory of the Homeric poems was quite generally accepted by critical scholars, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* being divided into a great number of smaller poems, which were supposed to have been worked together at a later time. Almost as a corollary of this belief in the composite and late authorship of these poems, their testimony both as to historical incidents and also in regard to the conditions of life and the civilisation of the period which they professed to represent was rejected as incorrect. There was even an inclination to resolve the Homeric poems as a whole into sun myths. Discoveries at Hissarlik, Mycenæ, Tiryns, the Argive Heræum, Cnossos, and elsewhere have shown us that the historical conditions of the Greek world at the time supposed to be represented by the poems of Homer corresponded in general to the representations of the Homeric poems. We have ascertained that some at least of the descriptions of ancient cities in the Homeric poems are historically correct and rest upon contemporary information or personal knowledge, and that certain incidents, such as the destruction of Troy, are historical. The argument against the early composition and continued transmission of the poems on the ground that the art of writing was not known

at so early a period, and even at a much later time was available only for comparatively brief monumental inscriptions, effective thirty years ago, has been discredited first by the discovery of elaborate systems of writing and the preservation of long literary works in regions in communication with the Greek world before Homer's time, and finally by the discovery within the bounds of the Greek world itself of at least two systems of writing antedating Homer, and of the use as writing material of clay tablets of the same character as those on which the Babylonian and Assyrian books and records were written.

The result of these archæological discoveries, showing us the historical trustworthiness of certain facts and descriptions made use of in the poems, has been to alter the opinions of critics regarding the composition and the date of the Homeric poems. In consequence the antiquity and unity of those poems are now generally acknowledged. It is also recognised that the poems are of great importance from the historical standpoint, that they represent fairly the general civilisation of the Greek world, and the customs and ideas of that world at a period not far removed from the time of the events narrated, and that some certainly of the events narrated are based on historical facts. On the other hand, no one supposes that the Homeric poems are sober history. Myths and legends are woven in, gods play a part which is manifestly unhistorical, there is a childlike representation of the relations of gods to men and of men to one another.

Traditional Roman history has passed through a somewhat similar course. Not long since it was held that Roman history began a little later than the end of the period of the kings. Before that there were only myths, fables, and traditions, out of which it was impossible to obtain anything of the character of reliable history. Partly through study of the monuments, partly through a more careful investigation of material by Mommsen and his school, we now have Roman history reconstructed almost from the time of Romulus and Remus. We have not returned to the position of that earlier age which

accepted literally the old stories of Romulus and Remus suckled by the wolf, but we recognise the historical facts underlying these stories, and with proper caution utilise them for purposes of history.

The history of the study of the ancient Indian and Persian sacred literature and historical traditions has run a similar course. One of our leading Persian scholars writes, "To-day the best scholars have outlived the age of radicalism, with its tendencies to push dates down to a comparatively late period, to deny reputed authorship, or everywhere to find composite authorship, and to reconstruct texts with minute subdivision. At least a more conservative tendency has set in, and Indian and Persian traditions receive more respect than they have for many a day. The support which the traditions of Buddhism, for instance, have received from recent archæological finds forms a striking illustration. With reference to dates, as a second point, there is a present inclination to push the Veda back a millennium or two earlier, rather than to make its time later. Although this cannot be said altogether with regard to the date of the Avesta, a statement to the like effect may be made with regard to its text, with which such liberties formerly were taken." The inclination in general among Indian and Persian scholars to-day is to push back the dates of the sacred books, to accept the traditional views in a modified form, and to maintain unity of authorship.

Somewhat similar has been the movement in the field of New Testament criticism. The result of investigation has been to establish the general accuracy and reliability, as well as the early date of the Gospels, the Acts, and many, if not all, of the Epistles attributed to St. Paul, as over against the views presented in the first half of last century. I do not mean that the old so-called orthodox views with regard to these books are now accepted; but the point to which critical study has returned is at least very far removed from the extreme radical positions of Baur and the Tübingen school.

But while in Homeric study, in the field of Roman history,

of the Veda, the Avesta, Buddhistic literature, and the Books of the New Testament the tendency has been toward a rehabilitation in a modified form of the older views regarding date, unity of composition, and general historical credibility, the tendency among Old Testament critics has seemed to be more and more in the opposite direction. The Hexateuch is divided by each new critic more minutely than by his predecessors, and the inclination is to refer its composition, or at least its final composition, to an always later date. There is the same tendency in the treatment of the prophetical and other literature of the Old Testament. The latest works on the Book of Isaiah, for instance, divide that book, partly on the ground of style, partly on the ground of thought, into a very large number of sections, some of which are ascribed to Isaiah, some to later unknown prophets, and some to redactors who have worked over earlier material of Isaiah himself.

Hand in hand with this tendency to divide and subdivide goes the inclination to assign both the completed products and also the constituent parts out of which those products were composed to ever later dates. The redaction of the Hexateuch was not completed before the third century B.C., if then. Portions of the Book of Isaiah are referred to a time as late as the Maccabees, the whole of the Wisdom literature is carried down into the post-Exilic period, and the entire Book of Psalms is relegated to the same epoch, some of the psalms being dated as late as Herod. This treatment of the Old Testament books in regard to date, authorship, and composition, has, of course, affected the whole conception of Hebrew history. Everything before the time of Jeremiah, or even before the Persian period, following the Exile, would seem to be involved in uncertainty, because all writings of an earlier date have been so much worked over that it is questionable what dependence can be placed upon them as representing the actual thought of earlier times. Against this inclination of Old Testament critics a protest is now being raised. It is claimed that archæological evidence has not been sufficiently

utilised by them, and that the evidence of archaeology tends to substantiate, in a general way, the credibility of the historical traditions of Israel, and by doing so indirectly to lend strength to the older traditional views of the date and authorship of books.

It is pointed out that the result of archaeological discovery in every other field has been to carry dates backward ; that the antiquity of civilisation and of the use of writing has been pushed back some thousands of years ; that many of the peoples about Palestine, or with whom the Hebrews are supposed to have been in contact, possessed a highly developed civilisation, and at least in some cases a literature at a period even earlier than that to which tradition would ascribe the Hebrew historical narratives, laws, poems, and the like. From this they argue that the early Hebrews must have possessed a similar civilisation, have been acquainted with writings, and have composed and handed down historical records, laws, poems, and the like.

Let us examine briefly what has been proved in the Old Testament field by archaeological discoveries, and the problems which still face us, partly as a result of those discoveries themselves. Sixty years ago, when Ewald's *History of Israel* was written, we were in the period of scepticism with regard to everything ancient. Babylonia had not yet begun to yield its ancient remains to the explorer, and what little had been found and examined in Egypt was not yet understood. The remains of ancient secular histories which had come down to us, such as the fragments of Berosus and Sanchoniathon, were not regarded as possessing any authority. The legendary stories of the early days of Rome had been discredited, as had been also the traditions of Greek antiquity. Our real knowledge of secular antiquity was supposed to commence about B.C. 500. Everything before that time was shadowy, and the wisest attitude for the scientific historian, with regard to conditions before that date, was one of agnosticism. Real history began about B.C. 500, and even then the field of that history was extremely limited. It included Greece and Rome,

and in a vague and imperfect way Egypt and parts of hither Asia as far as Persia. From the further East, from India and from China, literary remains claiming a great antiquity had been brought to Europe and deciphered and interpreted by European scholars; but while these remains claimed a great antiquity, they did not furnish the material for a definite and certain chronology, and whatever the opinions of individual scholars, there was no general agreement which rendered it possible to use this material for the earlier history of the human race. Geologists had reached the conclusion that the world was almost incredibly old, but the question of the date of the appearance of man upon the earth was still unsettled. Some held to a very early, and some to a later date; but for all practical purposes there was an agreement that civilisation could not be said to have begun much earlier than the millennium before Christ. Writing was supposed to have been invented, or at least to have become practically useful, not earlier than about B.C. 600, but no definite and detailed knowledge of man in a state of higher civilisation was available, as already stated, before about B.C. 500. That being the point of view of the scientific historians with regard to ancient literature and ancient civilisation, it was inevitable that the Old Testament record and the Old Testament literature should be viewed with suspicion. The Old Testament claimed to present the history of a high civilisation, advanced religious development, and literary activities, commencing somewhere in the latter half of the second millennium B.C. Critical students were naturally inclined to discredit this testimony as exceptional, and apparently in contradiction to everything else that was known. How, for instance, was it possible that these things should have been written down and preserved, as was claimed, in view of the fact that writing did not seem to have been available for practical purposes earlier than about B.C. 600?

Without going into the details of the wonderful story of archæological discoveries and the decipherment of ancient inscriptions during the last sixty years, I may say that at the present day we have, from one source and another, a pretty

fair picture of an advanced stage of civilisation prevailing through parts at least of Asia Minor, Armenia, and Mesopotamia, in the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates from the sources to the mouths of those rivers, in Persia and adjacent regions, in Southern Arabia, in Egypt, and apparently also in Syria, including Palestine and the neighbouring islands, in the latter half of the third millennium B.C. At or about this time also civilisation spread to China, and shortly after this India was occupied by a civilised race. At the close of the third millennium B.C. the civilised portion of the Eastern hemisphere comprised, as far as we now know, hither Asia, with the adjacent islands and coast lands of Europe, Egypt, Nubia in Africa, China, and a part of India. There are two parts of this larger territory in which recent researches have shown a civilisation still much more ancient, namely, Egypt and the lower part of the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates, commonly called Babylonia. In both of these inscribed records carry history back, as is ordinarily claimed, to a period about B.C. 4,000 to 5,000; while from Babylonia we have evidence of civilised peoples dwelling in cities and organised states, making pottery and building temples and houses still a thousand years earlier.

An immense mass of inscribed material has been secured from Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, and Persia. The earliest monuments from Babylonia and Egypt, to which reference has already been made, going back to B.C. 4,000 or 5,000, give us the names of kings and cities and temples, notices of expeditions and conquests, showing us that at that early time the extent of the civilised world with which those countries were in contact was not inconsiderable. Detailed records of the life of the people begin somewhere in the third millennium B.C. From that time on we are able to draw an accurate picture of the life which the people lived. Writing was common and freely practised. For purposes of political history these inscriptions are not so directly valuable as those of a somewhat later date from Assyria. Assyrian history commences in the second millennium B.C., but official records

systematically dated, recording the succession of events, expeditions, eclipses, etc., do not occur until the first part of the following millennium, when Assyria became the great conquering world-power. From the middle of the ninth century B.C., when Israel first came in contact with Assyria, onward to the latter part of the seventh century, when Nineveh was destroyed and the Assyrian power annihilated, we have a series of records, in which Israel and Judah are mentioned from time to time, constituting a general political history of hither Asia. By means of these records we have been able to reconstruct Hebrew chronology for that period, and to check and confirm the Hebrew historical records. These Assyrian records have been especially valuable in giving us a broader survey than we find in the Bible, making known the names of kings and nations, showing us their relations to one another, their hostilities and alliances, their relative strength, etc. This has thrown much light on the political conditions of Israel's world and the political career of the people of Israel from David's time onward, and has enabled us to understand the causes of some of the events recorded in the Bible, and the meaning of not a few references formerly misunderstood, or not understood at all. The general progress of events has been elucidated, and the part which Israel played in the greater scheme of history made apparent. Late Babylonian and Persian records are not so systematic in their historical survey, and do not contain the same direct notices of Israel and Judah. They do, however, give us a general view of the political history of Israel's world during the period following the fall of Nineveh. In general the historical records so far discovered confirm the statements and the historical representations of Samuel, Kings, and the Prophets. Hebrew history as recorded in those books is proved by the comparison to be honest and trustworthy, but not infallible, as, for instance, in the matter of chronology, nor altogether without bias, and a natural inclination toward a patriotic colouring of the story. Chronicles, on the other hand, is shown to be of little or no value for purposes of political

history, while Esther, Daniel, and Jonah, once supposed to be historical, are made to appear fictitious.

With regard to the period preceding David, the conditions are different. Up to the middle of the second millennium B.C. our knowledge of Syria and Palestine is indirect and very fragmentary and meagre, derived from allusions to campaigns in Babylonian and Egyptian inscriptions. To the beginning of the second half of that millennium belong the Tel el-Amarna tablets, found in Egypt, containing letters from numerous kings and governors throughout Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia, addressed to their Egyptian suzerain or ally. These letters show us the condition of Palestine shortly before the Israelite invasion and conquest. These conditions accord with what we are told in Numbers, Joshua, and Judges of the period of the conquest, and indeed make clear to us why that conquest was possible. They show us also peoples kindred to the Hebrews pressing into the country from the east and north, and incidentally throw light on the meaning of the race stories contained in the legends of the patriarchs in Genesis. They show too that the language of Jerusalem and of Canaan in general was Hebrew, and confirm the tradition of the Israelites, contained in the Old Testament, but formerly misunderstood, that their ancestors were Aramaeans or Syrians, speaking originally an Aramaic tongue, and adopting the Hebrew language from the natives of Canaan whom they finally dispossessed, or from whom they inherited (the Hebrew word used for taking possession of the country has both of these meanings).

The Tel el-Amarna letters show that in the fourteenth century B.C. the Babylonian script and the Babylonian language were *lingua franca* for the whole region from Babylonia westward and northward to the Mediterranean. Apparently a condition existed similar to that in Europe in the middle ages, when Latin was the language of written communication and the monks were the scribes. The vernacular was not used for writing, and on the other hand, Latin was understood by few besides the scribes who wrote it. As

it was with Latin in Europe in the fourteenth century A.D., so it was with Babylonian in Asia in the fourteenth century B.C.

But the Babylonian script was not the only writing in use in the world at that time. Egypt had had for ages an independent hieroglyphic script of its own. The Hittites, also, in central Asia Minor and Armenia, stretching down into Syria, had a peculiar writing of their own, many monuments in which have been discovered, but not yet deciphered. In Crete, and perhaps also on the neighbouring shores of Asia Minor, if not in Greece, another system of writing, apparently of independent origin, was in use at the same period. In these regions there existed a highly developed civilisation, pottery decoration had attained a high grade of excellence, and painting and sculpture were freely used.

It was at this period, the second half of the second millennium B.C. that, according to its own tradition, the people of Israel came into being. Under the guidance of Moses, the tribes of Israel, who had been enslaved in Egypt, were welded into a nation, which, marching out of the Sinaitic Desert, took possession of the country east of the Jordan. Under Moses' successor, Joshua, they entered Palestine, but did not finally become real masters of the entire country until the time of David, about B.C. 1000. Before the time of Moses, according to the traditions gathered together in the books of Genesis and Exodus, the ancestors of the Hebrews had been *bedawin* Syrians, who had wandered gradually downward from Mesopotamia through Syria and Palestine and so on to Egypt, where they had been enslaved.

Besides the accounts of the ancestors of the Hebrews, Genesis also contains other legends and traditions, about the creation of the world, the origin of evil, the inventions of civilisation, the division of languages, etc. We were already familiar from Phœnician fragments with the Phœnician forms of some of these stories. Babylonian and Assyrian discoveries have given us the Babylonian forms of others, and especially of the Flood legend. The material at present at our disposal does not enable us to determine to what extent

we have here race traditions common to a number of peoples and belonging to the ancestors of Babylonians, Phœnicians, and Hebrews alike, and to what extent these stories are due to the direct or indirect influences of Babylonia on Phœnicia and Canaan (for the Canaanites, from what we know, may be supposed to have been substantially one with the Phœnicians in their religion, mythology, etc.). As to the historical character of such material as cosmogonies, civilisation myths, and the like, archæology will presumably never have anything to say, except in a negative manner. The race traditions, however, are so far substantiated by archæological discoveries that we now have reason to suppose that in the second millennium B.C. the Aramœans were pressing, or being pressed southward into southern Syria and were roaming among the settled population of Palestine, or in organised bands seeking to obtain permanent foothold there. The Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites, kindred peoples with the Hebrews, were parts of this Aramœan invasion, which developed a national life and acquired settled habitations before the Hebrews. Like the latter, they adopted the language of Canaan in place of their native Aramœan. So far as our information goes it is consistent with the Hebrew representation of the ancestors of the race as Syrian nomads (Deut. xxvi. 5), wandering down from Mesopotamia through Palestine and into Egypt. One strange chapter of the Book of Genesis (xiv.) tells of a conquering expedition of Elamite and Babylonian kings against the kings of the Jordan valley, and of the surprise and discomfiture of the conquerors by Abraham the Hebrew. Babylonian records show us that such an expedition might well have been undertaken in the latter part of the third millennium B.C., under the king of Elam as overlord. The relations of Elam and the Babylonian cities mentioned are correct for that period, and the names used have either been found or are probable and correctly formed names. We have, however, found no record of this invasion, or of such a defeat of Elamites and Babylonians, or of the name of Abraham, or of the names of the kings and cities of the Jordan valley

mentioned in Genesis xiv. It has been suggested that we have here an historical incident, borrowed by a Jewish writer from a Babylonian tablet and woven into the history of the Hebrew patriarch Abraham. For the full solution of the problem of Genesis xiv. we must apparently await further discoveries.

In spite of the important part which Egypt plays in early Hebrew tradition, Egyptian discoveries have yielded little of importance for the elucidation of the Old Testament. We find Semitic nomads in the borderland of Egypt, and Semites at one period (the reigns of Amenophis III. and IV.) possessing great influence at the Egyptian court; then a change of dynasty takes place, the Semitic influence is overthrown, and the Semites in Egypt are oppressed. This would agree with the representations in Genesis and Exodus of the favour enjoyed by Joseph, if we can place him under Amenophis IV., and the oppression of Israel if we may ascribe that to the following Ramesside dynasty. The discovery of the store-city of Pithom, in Goshen, built under Rameses, seems to substantiate the historical accuracy of the statement in Genesis that such places were built by the Hebrew captives, and to point out the Ramessides as the Pharaoh of the oppression. The Pharaoh of the Exodus, according to this scheme, would then be Merenphtah or Merneptah. The only direct mention of Israel on an Egyptian monument occurs in an inscription of this monarch, and appears at first sight to overthrow the theory set forth above. He is recording his victories, and in the list of the peoples of Syria and Palestine vanquished by him he mentions Israel, saying, "The people of Israel is spoiled; it hath no seed." This is not an absolute proof that the people of Israel were settled inhabitants of Canaan at that period, but it certainly looks in that direction. As in the case of the Abraham story of Genesis xiv. above referred to, the question arises whether later Jewish writers have not made use of their knowledge of Egyptian history to attempt to fit into that history Israelite tradition. In the case of the story of Joseph, in Genesis, for instance, where

we have a great deal of local Egyptian colouring, it is noticeable that, so far as our present knowledge enables us to determine, the proper names belong, not to the supposed period of Joseph, but to about the tenth century B.C., the time of Solomon, when Egypt and Palestine were in close communication, and the Hebrews were beginning to write down their history and the traditions of their past. The suggestion is strong that, whatever tradition may lie behind it, the story of Joseph was written at that time. Moreover, the story of Joseph's temptation, his continence in the face of trial, and his imprisonment under the false accusation of his employer's wife, are singularly reminiscent of the Egyptian story of the two brothers. The light thrown by Egyptian discovery on the residence of Israel in Egypt and its exodus from Egypt is so far only sufficient to make us aware of serious problems, which we cannot yet solve.

Egyptian discoveries seem, as I shall endeavour to show in another chapter, to have elucidated the origin of the Ark and of the Decalogue. For the references to Egyptian alliances, matrimonial connexions, invasions, etc., contained in the books of Kings, Chronicles, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, we have found no confirmation from the Egyptian monuments, and indeed no allusions of any description to Israel or Judah, nor, in fact, anything which throws light, except in the most indirect manner, on the external relations of Egypt during that period.

For the customs and culture of the Israelites we have been enabled, on the principle of the "unchanging East," to obtain much light from modern Oriental customs, both in and out of Palestine, and from Babylonian, Egyptian, and Arabian monuments, inscriptions, and writings, both ancient and modern. In the history of the religious development of Israel we have been able, through the assistance largely of archaeology, to derive much information from the kindred and neighbouring nations. For the earliest period the pre-Islamic remains of Arabia furnish the counterparts to early Hebrew uses and ideas. For later periods many suggestions have come to the

Bible student from discoveries in various fields, such as the Marseilles sacrificial tablet, which shows a kinship in ritual prescriptions and ritual names with the Hebrew. Babylonian ceremonial laws also show a striking resemblance in certain particulars to the Hebrew Levitical legislation. Egyptian and Babylonian poems have revealed to us an identity of poetical construction in Egyptian, Babylonian, and Hebrew, while we find both Babylonians and Israelites making use in their religious poetry of identical or similar technical expressions, like the "how long," and some of the same religious ideas appear in both Babylonian and Hebrew psalms, like the "secret faults," referred to in another chapter.

Now and then archæological discoveries instead of resolving difficulties present fresh problems, like the discovery in Egyptian inscriptions of the names Joseph-el and Jacob-el in Palestine in the third millennium B.C., or the discovery of the existence of Jerusalem under that name in the fourteenth century B.C. (which may, however, fall in with the story of Melchizedek, priest-king of Salem, in Genesis xiv.). Some of these discoveries raise rather than answer questions with regard both to the literary and religious development of Israel. We find the Babylonians having, from the very earliest period, penitential psalms, strikingly similar, not merely in metre, but also in conception and sometimes phraseology to some of the Hebrew psalms. Are we to suppose that the Hebrews were influenced at a late date by the Babylonians in the matter of psalmody? or are these resemblances due to development from a common source, or to earlier Babylonian influence?—since we know that Babylon was the dominant influence in Palestine from B.C. 4000 to a period shortly before the Hebrew invasion and conquest.

It will be observed that the archæological material which the Old Testament critic has at his disposal is almost altogether the result of researches in other countries than Palestine. Palestine has been admirably mapped and surveyed west of the Jordan, and in part east of that stream. The surface remains have been noted and the evidence of names made

use of with remarkable success for the identification of ancient sites. As a result we know the location of the larger part of the places mentioned in the Old Testament, and of almost all of those which possessed historical importance. It has become possible to write a historical geography of Palestine, and Professor G. A. Smith has pointed out that our geographical knowledge of the country may be successfully used for critical purposes, and that so far as the Hexateuch is concerned the geographical identifications support in general the position of the literary critics. Little, however, has been done in the way of excavation, and the results of the excavations which have been undertaken have been disappointingly meagre. The excavations which have been conducted at Lachish, Jerusalem, Azekah, Gath, and a couple of unidentified sites show us that fortified towns existed in Palestine from about the eighteenth century onward, and that the country was, in those earlier days, in close connexion with Egypt, which corresponds with the information obtained from the Egyptian monuments. We find, also, fortifications and reconstructions of those cities which may be supposed to correspond with certain periods of Bible history. A few inscribed seals and pottery handles have been discovered in these excavations, indicating conditions of civilisation which would correspond in a general way with the Bible account; but no inscriptions have been found bearing directly on the Bible narrative (unless the pottery handles with royal inscriptions found at some of the sites excavated elucidate and confirm the obscure passage, 1 Chron. iv. 23), except the inscribed stele found on the surface of the ground at Dhiban in Moab, of Mesha, a contemporary of Ahab, which confirms and throws further light on the Bible account of the relations of Israel to Moab, giving us the history of those relations, however, from quite a different point of view. The Siloah inscription, from the water-tunnel under the hill of Ophel, a private inscription made by the workmen who cut the tunnel, is interesting palaeographically, and as showing a fairly common use of writing, but is absolutely without reference,

historical or religious, and is of somewhat uncertain date. From the New Testament times we have only the important Barrier inscription from the Temple. From Palestine itself, then, we have practically nothing in the way of inscribed records. Until such records are obtained—and it may be assumed with a reasonable degree of confidence that such records will be found, for the period before the Exile, by excavations in Palestine, and for the period following the Exile, in part, at least, by excavations in Babylonia—we have little or no documentary or monumental material with which to check the literary results of the critics. A few dated records—a couple of hymns, a few laws, a letter such as Jeremiah wrote to the people in Babylonia or the people in Babylonia wrote to Jeremiah—would give us a definite fixed basis from which to work, something by which to check the conclusions as to date which are now based and must, in our present knowledge, be based largely on subjective data.

To sum up the position at the present moment, our archaeological light on the Old Testament has come from foreign lands and foreign hands, and we have practically nothing from Palestine.

From Egypt what we have obtained is perplexing in the extreme. The monuments do not necessarily contradict the Hebrew records as to the earlier periods, but neither can we say with any certainty that they support the Bible narrative. This I say in depreciation of the statements, published from time to time, that archaeology has proved the truth of the Bible story. Such statements are misleading.

Somewhat the same caution is needed with regard to the discoveries from Babylonian sources, as they bear on the early Hebrew narrative. We have gained from those inscriptions most important information with regard to the early relations of Babylonia, and even of Elam to the West-land, but to say that, for example, the truth of the narrative in Genesis xiv. (Abraham's pursuit and defeat of the four allied kings) is proved by Babylonian records is dangerously misleading. We have, as the result of Assyrian excavations, Babylonian

cosmogonies, civilisation myths, a Flood legend, and the like, which are in many respects strikingly similar to the accounts of the Creation, the Flood, etc., in the first part of Genesis. We had already literary fragments containing similar material from Phoenicia, still more strikingly similar, as far as it went, to the Bible. Assyriologists point out singular resemblances in fact and phraseology between the Babylonian ceremonial laws and the Levitical legislation of the Hebrews, while the discovery of a few Phoenician antiquities and inscriptions has revealed an even more singular resemblance between certain Hebrew and Phoenician rites and rules. Were these things part of a common inheritance? Are the resemblances due to early Babylonian domination in the West-land? Are they due to later contact with and influence of Phoenicians and Canaanites or Assyrians and Babylonians on Israelites and Jews? Are they due partly to one and partly to another of these causes?

With the matter of writing I deal in another chapter. The problem of the language, the script and the material in or on which the Old Testament was written is a most interesting one, and important both as to the date of the writings and the preservation of the contents.

In conclusion, let me add that some well-meaning apologists for the Bible, in laying before the religious public the story of the marvellous increase of our knowledge of antiquity as a result of the discoveries of the last sixty years, have presented a picture of the conditions of the early Hebrews not borne out by the facts and quite contrary to the statements of the Bible. Because Egypt and Syria and Babylonia were civilised, it does not follow that the Hebrews of Moses' time and their ancestors of the patriarchal period, although living by and in those countries, were familiar with their culture and their arts. They are represented in the Bible as like the *bedawin* Arabs, who wander through or live in those countries to-day, and are yet absolutely untouched by their civilisation. The Hebrews dwelt in Egypt for generations, and there is no trace of Egyptian influence in their customs, laws, rites, or

religion, except possibly in the Ark and the Decalogue, both attributed to Moses, who alone of the Hebrews is represented in the Bible story as entering into any intimate relation with the Egyptians. As *bedawin* the Hebrews entered Egypt, as *bedawin* they came out. As *bedawin* they invaded Canaan. There first they acquired their civilisation, but not their religion. Such is the Bible representation. To give us pictures of Babylonian or Egyptian civilisation in those early days is beside the point. Our best analogy at present for the conditions of the Hebrews before the invasion of Canaan is what little we have been able to learn of pre-Islamic Arabia. Probably we shall never find archæological remains or inscriptions from, or bearing primarily upon this earliest period. For the period after the invasion of Canaan it would seem that we ought, as a result of sufficient excavating, to find remains, monuments, and inscriptions in Palestine which will illustrate and expand the Bible narrative in the same way that excavations in Greece and Italy have illustrated Greek and Roman literature and expanded our knowledge of the history of those countries.

CHAPTER XI

HOW THE OLD TESTAMENT WAS WRITTEN

II. ON WHAT?

IN Jeremiah xxxii. 11 and following verses we have an account of the use of clay tablets for contract purposes among the Jews in the time immediately preceding the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians, that is, the beginning of the sixth century B.C. To be sure neither the translation in the King James nor yet that in the Revised Version gives any hint of this. The former renders the eleventh verse, "So I took the evidence of the purchase, *both* that which was sealed *according* to the law and custom, and that which was open." The latter thus, "So I took the deed of the purchase," etc., almost exactly as in the earlier version. Literally, word for word, the Hebrew reads, "And I took the deed (book) of purchase the closed the commandment and the statutes and the open." This manifestly makes no sense; nor, for that matter, do the translations of the King James and Revised Versions. The Greek text of this verse reads, according to Swete's text, "And I took the deed of purchase, the sealed"; to which the Sinaitic and Alexandrine texts add, "and the published," or "read aloud," which was, I think, part of the original Septuagint translation, omitted in the Vatican text because of its unintelligibility to the scribe. The Septuagint did not have "the commandment and the statutes," and "the

open" or "revealed," which are added in some of the inferior later texts, manifestly out of our Masoretic Hebrew text. A comparison of the Septuagint Greek with our Masoretic Hebrew suggests, then, that the words, "the commandment and the statutes," were not part of the original text. This suggestion becomes practically a certainty when we compare, in the Hebrew original, verse 14, which repeats verse 11 without the words in question, thus, "Take these writings, this deed of purchase, both the closed and this open record, and put them in an earthen vessel, that they may endure many days." The Greek reads, "Take this deed of purchase and the deed that is published (or read aloud)," etc.

The direction to "put them in an earthen vessel" first gave me the clue to the meaning of the whole. Hanameel ben Shallum, Jeremiah's cousin, came to Jeremiah while the latter was imprisoned in the Temple, during the siege of Jerusalem by the Babylonians, and called upon the latter to buy his property without the walls, at Anathoth, in accordance with the law of redemption. The deed of sale, described as above, and subscribed by a number of witnesses, Jeremiah caused to be buried in an earthen jar. Now this is precisely what the Babylonians used to do not infrequently with their deeds and records, where they wished to preserve them with great care. I have found at Nippur deeds buried in the earth in earthenware jars, as here described; but those deeds were on clay tablets. Ordinarily a deed or a record on a clay tablet was single. The clay tablet, anywhere from one to twelve inches or even more in length, was inscribed with the terms of the contract or deed, to which were attached the names of a number of witnesses and seals. These clay tablet contracts were ordinarily baked in the sun; sometimes they were burned in a kiln. Where particular care was desired the tablet was inclosed in an envelope of clay, on which envelope the terms of the contract were again recorded, and the names of witnesses and seals attached.

The outer and inner records do not, in any case with which I am familiar, correspond word for word, but for the substance

one is a repetition of the other. A comparison of the Hebrew and Greek accounts of the transaction between Jeremiah and Hanameel will, I think, convince the reader that the similarity to Babylonian methods extends further than the burial of the deed in a clay jar. Assume that the material on which the record of purchase was written was clay—a clay tablet—and the passage as it stands, or at least as it stood in the original text before it received the addition which we now have in the Hebrew in verse 11, that is, the words, “the commandment and the statutes,” becomes plain at once. Because the record was to be preserved with especial care, therefore it was recorded not on a single tablet, but on what is known, in the parlance of Assyriology, as a case tablet, that is, as described above, a clay tablet covered with an envelope of clay, on which envelope the substance of the deed within, the names of witnesses, and the like were recorded. “The open and the closed” are two parts of the same thing, the one the duplicate of the other.

We have here, then, a notice of the use of clay tablets for the purpose of contracts, deeds, and the like among the Hebrews in the time of Jeremiah. The passage became unintelligible to the later scribes, after the use of clay tablets was given up. Apparently it was already unintelligible at the time when the Greek translation was made. Nevertheless, that translation preserved literally what was found in the Hebrew, although translating with evident lack of appreciation of the meaning of the Hebrew words.

At a later date the Hebrew text in verse 11 was corrupted by the insertion of a pietistic gloss, which some scribe had written on the margin. This scribe was apparently seeking to find the hidden religious meaning in the words, so dark to him, “the open and the closed.” The same word for “closed” occurs, so far at least as the consonants are concerned, in Isaiah viii. 16, where Isaiah is directed to “seal (or close) the law” in his disciples. This suggested to the scribe a reference in the dark passage to “the law,” that is, “the commandment and the statutes,” and he wrote on

the margin, or above the line, those words, which later crept into the text. Such pietistic glosses, be it said, are not uncommon in the Hebrew text of the Prophets.

While this passage gives evidence of the use of clay tablets for contracts, it also shows that at the time when the Hebrew text assumed its final shape, such a use of clay tablets as writing material was no longer known, the unintelligible form in which the passage appears in our Bible being due to the fact that the scribes were not acquainted with the method of writing and preserving contracts referred to. In the original the contract was described as written on a tablet of clay. This was covered with an envelope of clay, also inscribed, and the whole was buried in the earth in a clay jar. The same use of clay tablets for documentary purposes seems to be referred to in Job xiv. 17, the correct translation of which is, I think, "Shut up in a packet is my transgression, and Thou smearest (clay) over mine iniquity." That is, God has written the record of Job's transgressions, and inclosed it in an envelope of clay. He has put it in what Assyriologists know as a "case tablet."

The Tel el-Amarna tablets, found in Egypt a dozen years ago, are evidence of the use of clay tablets for purposes of official correspondence in Palestine and Syria, as well as Babylonia, in the fourteenth century B.C. The discovery of one clay tablet in the Mound of Tel Hesy, presumably the ancient Lachish, by Dr. Bliss, excavating for the Palestine Exploration Fund, a half-dozen years later, confirmed this evidence for Palestine. We have, then, clay tablets in use in Palestine for purposes of official correspondence in the fourteenth century B.C., before the Hebrews entered Palestine; and we have clay tablets in use among the Jews for the purpose of contracts at the beginning of the sixth century B.C.

Now this use of clay tablets was the use common in Babylonia and Assyria and the countries under Babylonian or Assyrian influence. We find clay tablets in use northward in Armenia, and as far to the north-west certainly as

Cappadocia in Asia Minor, not to speak of their use in Syria and Palestine, as attested by the discoveries at Tel el-Amarna. Recent excavations at Cnossos, in Crete, reveal a similar use in the islands of the *Æ*gean. In Babylonia and Assyria these tablets were used for all purposes involving writing, that is, not only for contracts, letters, and archives, but also for books. A book might consist of one tablet or of a considerable number of tablets. In the latter case the tablets were arranged with headings and numbers, and the last words of one tablet were repeated at the beginning of the next, so as to secure the proper arrangement and to show what tablets belonged together to constitute one composition. No direct evidence has yet been given that clay tablets were used as books, that is, compositions of a literary character, outside of Babylonia and Assyria, unless the Cretan tablets above referred to should furnish that evidence. The clay tablets found in Cappadocia, Syria, and Egypt are letters, contracts, and the like. It is merely an inference from the use of clay tablets for books in Babylonia and Assyria that they may have been so used also in the other countries which borrowed from them the custom of writing on clay tablets.

While we find this use of clay tablets as writing material in Babylonia and in Egypt, on the other hand, except for the Tel el-Amarna records above noted, we find the use of papyrus and other similar substances, which were inscribed with ink by means of a pen. This method of writing Egypt finally taught the world, even Babylon ultimately abandoning the use of clay tablets to accept in their stead the parchment, or papyrus, and ink, which had become universal everywhere. But until a late period Babylonia stood for the use of clay tablets incised by a stylus, and Egypt for the use of pen and ink.

There is still one other material that was used for writing both in Babylonia and Egypt, namely, stone; but for practical purposes books cannot be written on stone. Inscriptions giving the records of victories, or containing codes of laws, may be written on stone or metal, however, and have been so

written in various lands and countries. Hebrew tradition says that the most ancient Hebrew laws, those of the Decalogue, were inscribed on stone tablets (Exod. xxxi. 18; Deut. ix. 9). One need not think of large stones of a monumental shape, such as are represented in the paintings in our churches and galleries. Such large tables containing laws or ritual regulations have existed at various places, it is true. Tables of this character were discovered at Marseilles and in Crete, and we have reason to suppose that both the Romans and the Greeks made use of similar tables. Perhaps there may have been tables of that sort erected at some time or another in the Hebrew temples; but so far as the Ten Commandments are concerned, the accounts contained in Exodus and Deuteronomy suggest that they were originally written on small tablets, eight, ten, or twelve inches in length, which could be readily contained in a box, and carried from place to place, as we are told was the earlier custom in Israel. Such small tablets of stone have been found from time to time in Babylonia. I recall one beautiful specimen found by us at Nippur, containing a list of garments dedicated in the temple of Bel, or contained in the temple treasury.

The same word which is used to describe the stone tablets of the Decalogue in Exodus xxxi. 18 and Deuteronomy ix. 9 is used in reference to wooden tablets, panels, or planks, in other passages in the Bible. In 1 Kings vii. 36 the word is used for the plates or panels on the top of the bases of the molten sea or bath constructed for the Temple at Jerusalem, on which were engraved cherubim, lions, or palm trees, "according to the space of each." In Canticles viii. 9 the word is used to mean the panels or planks of a door, and in Ezekiel xxvii. 5 it is the planks of a ship. In Habakkuk ii. 2 the same word is used to describe the "tables" on which the prophet is to write his vision, in such a manner that "he may run that readeth it." The word for "write," used in this last passage, seems to have meant primarily, "to dig" or "cut into." It is only used here and in Deuteronomy i. 5 and xxvii. 8. In the latter passage it means clearly to engrave, or cut in stone,

but in Deuteronomy i. 5 its sense would seem to be more general. It is usually rendered to "declare," or "set forth"; but I am inclined to think that in the original it meant "write." The word, as stated above, should mean, from its derivation, "cut into," that is, inscribe with a chisel or a stylus, rather than write with a pen. The thought in the mind of the writer of Habakkuk ii. 2 was clearly engraving, or inscribing on tablets of stone, metal, or clay. It seems to me that the writer of Deuteronomy i. 5 was led to his choice of words by the recollection of the stone tablets of the Decalogue, and so he wrote (rendering the passage literally): "Moses began to inscribe this law."

In the famous passage, Isaiah viii. 1, the prophet is told by the Lord to take "a large tablet, and write upon it with a chisel of a man." The tool named here as a writing implement is the same which is made use of to fashion the molten calf (Exod. xxxii. 4), while the word used here for tablet appears to mean a piece of smooth, polished metal. The same word is used once again in the Old Testament, in the song about women's vanities, in Isaiah iii. 23, where it is supposed to mean "mirrors," which were made of metal.

In Job xix. 24 reference is made to an iron stylus to be used for cutting letters in the rock. This passage is somewhat complicated by the mention of lead in connexion with the iron pen, so that the writer speaks of the characters as "graven in the rock with an iron stylus and lead." In Jeremiah xvii. 1 we have the same iron stylus, but with a diamond point. This word for stylus is used in two other places in the Bible, Psalm xlvi. 2 and Jeremiah viii. 8. In both of these places it is ordinarily rendered "pen." I am not sure that there is any proper ground for that rendering. Certainly the root means to "cut into," and the word primarily indicates a stylus, not a pen.

So much we have which shows us the practice of inscribing on stone and metal for purposes of permanent record in the earliest periods of Hebrew history and for the use of clay tablets for documentary purposes. If we turn to the books of

Jeremiah and Ezekiel, we find in use as books papyrus and parchment rolls, written in ink by pens. So in Jeremiah xxxvi. 18 we read that Baruch wrote with ink in a book at the dictation of Jeremiah. Jehudi brings this book to the King, who, after he has heard three or four columns read, cuts it with a penknife and throws it into the fire in the brasier, where it is burned up. Evidently it was written on something like parchment or papyrus.

Turning to Jeremiah's contemporary prophet, Ezekiel, we get further light on the precise form of the books of that day. Ezekiel ii. 10 and the following verses tell us of a book-roll which could be unrolled from its staves and spread out. In Ezekiel ix. 2 we find scribes wearing ink-horns in their girdles. It is clear that at the time of Jeremiah and Ezekiel book-rolls, such as are used in Jewish synagogues to this day, were in familiar use, and that there was a class of scribes whose business it was to write upon parchment, papyrus, etc., and who carried ink-horns in their girdles as the utensils and insignia of their trade, as do the Oriental scribes of the present day. All the paraphernalia of the scribes' art, including the penknife (Jer. xxxvi. 23), were then in existence.

But books are referred to in passages earlier than the times of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Were they rolls, written on papyrus or parchment? There are two passages which would seem to suggest a different meaning for the word "book" in the earlier times. One of these passages is Isaiah xxx. 8, written perhaps about B.C. 702. Here tablet and book are put together as synonymous. Isaiah is to write on a tablet, and on a book he is to inscribe it. Following the Hebrew use the same thing is said twice. The Greek, by the way, renders the Hebrew word meaning tablet by "tablet of boxwood," and a passage in one of the Apocryphal books (Second Esdras) refers to the same use of boxwood. The Greeks used boxwood tablets for certain purposes, as the Babylonians used clay tablets. Such wooden writing tablets have been found in Pompeii. They may have been used in Palestine also in the Greek period, but I think it extremely unlikely that they should have been so used

in the time of Isaiah. The book tablet referred to in Isaiah xxx. 8 was presumably a tablet of clay, like the book tablets of the Assyrians.

The other passage of a still earlier date is Exodus xxiv. 7. Here also the context seems to show that the book which Moses read was on tablets, but in this case probably of stone. From these two passages it appears clear that in the earlier days, until the time of Isaiah certainly, the word "book," as used by the writers of the Old Testament, does not necessarily mean a roll of parchment or papyrus, but may mean a tablet, or several tablets, of stone or clay. A "book" was, in fact, anything written. So in the Hebrew use the same word is used for the law book (Josh. i. 8), the Scriptures (Dan. ix. 2), a letter (2 Kings v. 5), a deed of sale (Jer. xxxii. 12), an "indictment" (Job xxxi. 35), and a "bill of divorce" (Deut. xxiv. 1). All these things were equally "books," just as among the Assyrians and Babylonians. Later the word came to be restricted to what we know as books, as in Joshua i. 8 and Daniel ix. 2. It is, perhaps, worth noting that with Ahaz the kings of Judah, and in the time of Hezekiah the whole population of Judah, began to come into very close contact with Assyria. Ahaz copied the fashion of the Assyrian altar, and, removing the ancient altar, put this new Assyrian altar in its place (2 Kings xvi. 10 ff.). Proverbs xxv. 1 suggests the possibility that Hezekiah copied the Assyrian kings in a more laudable manner. They collected—and especially the kings of the last, Sargonid, dynasty, which ascended the Assyrian throne early in the reign of Hezekiah—clay books in a great library at Nineveh. Hezekiah seems to have undertaken something of the same sort at Jerusalem. Were the books which he collected in the form of clay tablets? I think it probable that they were.

But in the century following Hezekiah a great change took place. The first three-quarters of that century, the seventh B.C., are almost a blank. We know certainly of no writings of that period, but immediately afterwards occurs a notable religious reform, and we enter upon a period of

great religious and literary activity, about which we are more fully informed than about any other period of Hebrew or Jewish history. One thing, however, we do know about this blank three-quarters of a century, namely, that it was a period when foreign influences were dominant in Judah. The worship of foreign gods was freely practised, and one of the kings of this period, Amon, bore the name of an Egyptian god. Was the use of papyrus or of skins written upon with ink introduced at this time? It seems to me at least not improbable.

To sum up our rather fragmentary information as to the material on which the Hebrews wrote. It is clear from the references which have been given that at an early time they were in the habit of writing records of one sort and another, including laws, on stone; that at the time of Isaiah they used metal in the same manner; that before the Hebrews entered Palestine, as early as the fourteenth century B.C., the people of the country made use of clay tablets for documentary purposes, and that the Hebrews at the time of Jeremiah made a similar use of clay tablets; that the books mentioned in the earlier writings of the Hebrews, up to B.C. 700, in the only two passages where there is any allusion to the material or shape of the books, appear to have been tablets, and that the only writing implement mentioned is a stylus. On the other hand, we find that while clay tablets were still in use for deeds and records in the beginning of the sixth century, yet at that time books were written with pen and ink on rolls. From this time onward this was the regular method of book-making. It may be added that with this period, when pen and ink began to be used, a great literary activity developed among the Jews. They began to collect and preserve everything that had been written, and to form the laws and histories which had come down to them into continuous books.

II. IN WHAT LETTERS?

The earliest writings of which we have information in Palestine were in the Babylonian cuneiform script. The letters from the Egyptian governors and subject kings in Palestine to their suzerain, contained on the clay tablets found at Tel el-Amarna, as also the letter found at Tel Hesy, in Palestine, were written in the Babylonian cuneiform characters, and almost all were in the Babylonian tongue. It was formerly supposed that the Phœnician alphabet was invented somewhere between B.C. 1500 and 2000, but the discovery of these letters written from Phœnician cities—Sidon, Tyre, Byblus, Beirut, etc.—to the Egyptian kings about B.C. 1400, not in the comparatively convenient Phœnician alphabet, but in the extremely cumbersome Babylonian cuneiform script, renders it probable that the Phœnician alphabet had not been invented at that time.

From about 1400 to the middle of the ninth century B.C. we have no inscriptions or written material of any description from Palestine or its neighbourhood. Then we begin to meet with inscriptions, in diverse places, in an alphabetic script. What the origin of that alphabetic script was and when it was invented are as yet unknown. Three theories of its origin prevail: (1) That it was derived from Egypt, the most commonly accepted opinion at the present moment, although I, personally, think it to be erroneous; (2) that it was derived from the Babylonian cuneiform script, which seems to me more probable; (3) that it was derived from the Hittites. Ancient tradition ascribes the invention of this alphabet to the Phœnicians, and presumably we may accept this tradition as correct. So far as our present knowledge goes, it would seem that it must have been perfected later than the fourteenth century B.C. and earlier than the ninth. In the fourteenth century we find the Babylonian script and the

Babylonian language in use; in the ninth the Phœnician script meets us in a completed form,¹ and the inscriptions are in the various vernacular.

One of the earliest inscriptions in the Phœnician alphabet which we possess is the famous Moabite stone—an inscription of King Mesha of Moab (2 Kings iii. 4 ff.), found at Dhiban, Dibon of the Bible (Num. xxi. 30; Isa. xv. 2), in 1868, in which Mesha relates how he threw off the yoke of the king of Israel, recovered and rebuilt the cities which had been taken or destroyed by the Israelites, expelled the worship of Yahaweh, and erected altars to Chemosh and Ashtor Chemosh, and dedicated to them the spoils and altars taken from Yahaweh. The language of the inscription is Moabite, a language substantially identical with Hebrew.

To about the same period, a little earlier or a little later, belongs the Baal Lebanon inscription, on eight fragments of bronze, found in Cyprus. These fragments were part of the rim of a bowl which had been consecrated to Baal Lebanon by a servant of Hiram, king of Sidon. How the bowl came to Cyprus we do not surely know, but Assyrian inscriptions of a later date record the fact that at least one Sidonian king took refuge in Cyprus to avoid the Assyrian wrath. The characters on this bowl are similar to those on the Moabite stone.

Later Phœnician inscriptions have been discovered in considerable numbers, like the longer Tabnith and Eshmunazar inscriptions on sarcophagi, found at Sidon, belonging to about

¹ The recent discovery of inscribed clay tablets in Crete may substitute a new theory of the origin of the alphabet for those above mentioned. At present all we know is that about B.C. 1400, or possibly even earlier, two systems of writing existed in Crete; the one, apparently the earlier, belonging chiefly or altogether to eastern Crete, was mainly hieroglyphic in character, and may have been suggested by the Egyptian hieroglyphics; the other, the later and more highly developed form, was entirely linear, bearing no resemblance to the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and apparently a native development or invention. Both of these scripts were used for inscribing records of some kind on clay tablets, as well as for the briefer seal inscriptions.

the fourth century B.C., and other shorter inscriptions of various dates. These inscriptions have been found throughout the whole Phœnician world, including also the world of Carthage. One of the longest inscriptions from the Carthaginian dominions is the tariff of temple dues found at Marseilles, and belonging, perhaps, to the close of the fifth century B.C. All these inscriptions, from the fourth century onward, are written in substantially the same characters, that variety of the Phœnician alphabet which we call, in the narrower sense, the Phœnician script.

From the Hebrews themselves we have the Siloah inscription, found in the Siloah tunnel under the Ophel hill at Jerusalem, and now in the Imperial Museum at Constantinople. This inscription was cut in the side of the tunnel by the workmen at the completion of the work. The characters on it are practically identical with those on the Moabite stone. The date of the inscription is still uncertain. It is generally supposed to belong to the times of Ahaz or Hezekiah, kings of Judah, at the close of the eighth century B.C.; but some scholars would ascribe it to a period as late as the first century B.C.

Besides the Siloah inscription we have some twenty old Hebrew seals, and a number of pieces of inscribed pottery found recently by Dr. Bliss. The dates of these gems and sherds are not yet well established. The oldest of them may belong to the ninth century B.C., the same period as the Moabite stone; the latest of them may probably be ascribed to the first or second century B.C. They show a form of the Phœnician alphabet midway between the Phœnician script and the script of the Moabite stone, but the differences between all three are such as to be apparent only to a specialist. This is the old Hebrew script.

German explorations at Zinjirli, in the extreme north of Syria on the boundary of Asia Minor, or in the extreme south of Asia Minor on the boundaries of Syria, according as one estimates those boundaries, a little more than ten years ago, brought to light Aramaean inscriptions of the eighth century

b.c. The earliest of these is on a basalt statue which Panammu of Jaidi erected to his god Hadad. From about the same period as these Aramæan inscriptions from Zinjirli we have inscriptions on Assyrian stone weights from Nineveh, bilingual clay tablets in Aramæan and cuneiform characters, and Aramæan inscribed seals. From the eighth century onward Aramaean inscriptions are found in considerable numbers. We have numerous dockets in the Aramæan script and tongue on the edges of clay tablets of all dates in Assyria and Babylonia. Of the sixth century b.c. we have a stela from Tema, in Arabia, about two hundred and fifty miles south-east of Edom. In the following century we find Aramæan inscriptions in Egypt.

The earliest Aramæan, Phoenician, and Moabite inscriptions are all strikingly similar, and are called by some the old Semitic script. By the sixth century b.c. the Aramæan had developed a character of its own, readily distinguished by specialists. By the fourth century the classical Phœnician script had developed among the Phœnicians. The Hebrew gems show a particular form for certain characters, which specialists call the old Hebrew script. It was presumably in this last-mentioned script that the earliest writings of the Old Testament were written, and this script maintained itself among the Jews until the second century b.c., or even later. But no parts of the Old Testament have been preserved among the Jews in that script. The Samaritan Pentateuch, however—that is, not the Pentateuch written in the Samaritan language, but the Pentateuch preserved by the Samaritan Church, which is nothing more nor less than our Hebrew Pentateuch—is preserved in a form of this Hebrew writing.

The Samaritan Church grew out of the Jewish Church about b.c. 400. We are told (Nehemiah xiii. 28) that a grandson of Eliashib the high priest had married the daughter of Sanballat, the leader of the Samaritans. When Nehemiah called upon the Jews to put away their foreign wives, Eliashib's grandson refused to do so and was expelled from Jerusalem with his wife. He took refuge with his

father-in-law, Sanballat, in Samaria, and established the Samaritan Church. He took with him a copy of the Pentateuch, which became the Bible of the Samaritan Church. More conservative than their southern neighbours, the Jews, the Samaritans never added to this Bible, and have retained it to the present time, not only in its original language, the Hebrew, but also in the original ancient writing. The Samaritan script deviates from the ancient Hebrew only in its caligraphical character, that is, the effort was made to render the script as beautiful as possible. It is an ornate type of the old Hebrew script.

The Samaritan Pentateuch is thus an evidence to us that at the close of the fifth century B.C. the Jewish Scriptures were written in the old Hebrew script. The Greek translation of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, made for the Greek-speaking Jews in Alexandria, from the third century B.C. onwards, shows us that at that period, also, the Jewish Scriptures were written in the old Hebrew characters, for there are certain errors in the Septuagint translation, due to confusion of letters, which could not have occurred had the script from which the translation was made been the square character in which the Hebrew Bibles are written to-day.

Coins struck in the Maccabæan period, *circa* B.C. 150 onward, also bear inscriptions in the old Hebrew characters, and even the coins of the revolt of the Jews under Kokba, 135 A.D., have inscriptions essentially in the same character. But, as we shall see presently, for purposes of ordinary writing, at least, the old Hebrew was probably giving way to the modern square script at the close of the Maccabæan period, and had completely yielded to the square script for manuscript purposes long before the time of Kokba. Matthew v. 18 shows us that at the time of Christ the later Jewish square script was fully established for the writing of the Law and, presumably, also for the Scriptures in general. The passage referred to reads: "Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away

from the law." The *jot* is the letter *yod*, and is referred to as the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet. That is true in the case of the later square script, but in the old Hebrew script the *yod* is one of the larger and rather more complicated letters.

The later square script was developed from the Aramaean writing. Between the fourth and first centuries B.C. we find the Aramaean script developing in the direction of greater elegance and greater distinctness. Two side developments of this Aramaean script, which have come down to us, are the Palmyrene, used in Palmyra, and the Nabatæan, found in inscriptions in the territory of Edom, Moab, and Ammon, and further southward and south-eastward in Arabia, in the first century B.C. and the first century A.D. One of these Nabatæan inscriptions found in Arabia dates from the ninth year of Harithat ("lover of his people"), who is the Aretas mentioned in 2 Corinthians xi. 32. This Nabatæan script is a very elegant and beautiful development from the old Aramaean, but not so clear and legible as the late Hebrew square script, which is, on the whole, the best script for purposes of ordinary use derived from that source.

Specialists think that they find the first traces of the later square script over a rock-hewn chamber at Arak el-Emir, in southern Gilead, east of the Jordan. Unfortunately, this inscription consists of only five letters, which no one has as yet been able to read satisfactorily. They are ascribed to the year B.C. 176. I have examined these letters on the spot and copied them and photographed them, but they did not seem to me to show this change from the old to the later square script. Moreover, historical notices of the construction of Arak el-Emir seem to me to render it probable that the inscription belongs to the end rather than to the beginning of the second century B.C.

The first inscription in actual square script which we possess is from the so-called tomb of St. James, in the Kedron Valley by Jerusalem. Here there is no mistaking the fact that we have the late square script and not the early Hebrew script,

or any allied form. The date of this inscription is some time in the first century B.C. Somewhere in that century, it seems to me the evidence shows us, the change was made in copies of the Scriptures from the old Hebrew script to the modern square script. This was, presumably, done for the sake of beauty and clearness, both of which the square script possessed in a degree far exceeding the old Hebrew script. The motives of the change were, therefore, the same which induced the Samaritans to beautify the old Hebrew script, in which they have continued to this day to write their Bible. The old Hebrew script was peculiarly liable to error in this—that a number of the letters so closely resembled one another that it was not always possible to distinguish them. This is true in all the older varieties of the Phoenician alphabet—the Moabite stone, the old Phoenician inscriptions, the old Aramæan inscriptions, and the old Hebrew inscriptions—and it will be observed that diverse transliterations of these inscriptions are always presented by different scholars for the simple reason that, as before said, certain letters are indistinguishable one from another. Some mistakes arising from this similarity of letters in the old Hebrew script appear in our Bibles to-day; that is, in transliterating from the old Hebrew to the later square script the scribes, owing to the similarity of certain letters, made mistakes. In doubtful or difficult passages errors have, in not a few cases, been corrected by scholars by retransliterating into the old Hebrew, when it becomes plain to the eye what the mistake is which was made by the scribes.

But the scribes of the Old Testament did not stop at this point. In the alphabet of the later square script there is the same number of letters as in the older alphabet, namely, twenty-two. There are no vowels in this alphabet, but only consonants. Certain letters, the smooth and rough breathings and *y* and *w* were capable of being used to indicate that an *a*, an *i*, or an *u* vowel was to be pronounced. In general, however, no indication of the vowel to be pronounced was given in the text, but only the consonants of the word were written. This was, of necessity, a very incomplete mode of writing, and

gave rise to many errors. One can judge, in part, what the difficulties of reading accurately a script written in this manner were if one will take a passage of ordinary English, eliminate the vowels, and then try to read it by the consonants. To be sure, the English and the Hebrew languages are different in character, and the confusion arising in English, were the vowels to be omitted, would be much greater than the confusion resulting from this method of writing in the Hebrew ; but one will at least obtain an idea, from such a process, of the difficulty of accurate reading in the old unpointed texts. In the case of proper names, for instance, it was impossible to determine how to pronounce them, without some knowledge outside of the mere text.

The tradition of the proper pronunciation of the Hebrew text, and its correct vocalisation, was maintained orally in the schools ; that is to say, the consonant text was supplemented by an oral tradition ; but the more remote that tradition became from the date of the original text the more liable it became to error. This is well illustrated in the case of Greek and Latin. Latin was preserved as the Church and school language throughout the middle ages, and the tradition of its correct pronunciation passed down from generation to generation. This tradition was supplemented by an alphabet much more developed than the old Hebrew, possessing vowels as well as consonants, and yet to-day we do not know certainly how to pronounce Latin. It is a matter of dispute among scholars, and still more is this the case with Greek. Among the Hebrews there are to-day two very distinct pronunciations —that of the *Sephardim*, or Spanish Jews, and that of the *Ashkenazim*, or Polish Jews, and yet the differences of pronunciation between these two have grown up since vowel points were introduced in the Hebrew text. Even with those helps to a correct pronunciation, it has been impossible to maintain a fixed standard ; much more was this the case before those helps were introduced.

The Greeks early felt the need of vowels in the alphabet, which they had adopted from the Phœnicians, and the earliest

Greek inscriptions which have come down to us show that they had already then added or developed vowels. It was Greek influence which finally led to the development of an apology for vowels, a system of points, among the Syrians. It was in the schools of Edessa that this system of pointing, as it was called, was introduced. First, diacritical signs were used to distinguish certain letters, indicating whether a letter was to be pronounced single or double, soft or hard (in the case of mutes), as vowel or consonant (in the case of semi-vowels), etc. Then this gave place to a system of vowel points, that is, points placed by a letter above or below, to indicate the vowel to be pronounced after that letter, or that no vowel at all was to be pronounced. This system reached its full development among the Hebrews not earlier than the seventh century probably, in Babylonia, and the eighth century in Palestine. More closely we cannot date it. We know that about 600 A.D. such points were not used in Hebrew Bible manuscripts, and that about 900 A.D. systems of pointing were fully developed.

The earliest pointed manuscript which has come down to us is the St. Petersburg codex of the prophets, dated 916 A.D. ; but the pointing in this is quite different from the system which ultimately prevailed among the Jews everywhere, and which is commonly called the Palestinian system. The earliest manuscripts having the latter system of pointing which we now possess are probably not earlier than the eleventh century A.D. ; but we have information of the existence of such pointed manuscripts as early as the middle of the preceding century. By that date, that is, the tenth century A.D., the Hebrew script had definitely assumed the form with which we are familiar in our printed Hebrew Bibles, written, as to the consonants, in a square character, the vocalisation indicated by certain marks above and below the line, and certain points indicating whether letters are to be doubled or not, whether mutes are hard or soft, etc. Of course, errors were made in this pointing or vocalisation of the text, most of them of little importance, a few materially changing the sense. Many of these latter can be corrected by a critical process, and often

by comparison of the Greek translation made while the old script was in use and before any system of pointing had been introduced.

To sum up, the Hebrew Scriptures were written originally in the old Hebrew script, a special Hebrew development of the Phoenician alphabet. Somewhere, probably in the first century B.C., they were transliterated out of these early characters into the later square characters—a script of a very different description. Originally, the Scriptures were written in consonants only, and without division of words. Several centuries after Christ points of various descriptions began to be introduced to assist the readers in a correct reading of the text. These points at first were simply diacritical. Then they were developed so as to indicate, in a rough way (for, at the best, the Hebrew system of vowel punctuation is an extremely rough one, indicating a very small range of vowel sounds actually used), the vowels to be pronounced after the respective consonants. Gradually also words were separated. At least two complete systems of pointing were developed among the Hebrews. One of these systems we find in use in a manuscript of the ninth century. The other, which ultimately prevailed, was in use at the same time, but has not come down to us in any manuscript earlier than the eleventh century A.D. From that century dates our first complete manuscript of the Old Testament.

CHAPTER XIII

STONE WORSHIP

A FORM of worship not uncommon among primitive peoples is the worship of stones. This worship of stones was peculiarly characteristic of the religion of the heathen Arabians before the time of Mohammed. At every sanctuary one or more stones were set up. Generally these stones were unworked, like the *caaba* at Mecca. Sometimes they were rudely hewn. By preference they were oblong or cone-shaped. These stones served a double purpose. They represented the god of the sanctuary, and at the same time they served as altars. The stone was not regarded as an image of the god, but the god was supposed to have his regular dwelling in the stone, or to be in some way connected with it, so that through the stone one might come into peculiar relation with the god. Sacrifice consisted in pouring the blood of the creature killed upon this stone, or smearing the stone with blood and pouring out the rest of the blood in a hole at the bottom of the stone. Then the sacrificer and his friends ate the flesh of the creature offered. The blood had been given to God through the stone, and the people ate the flesh. In case of a covenant or treaty, seven stones were sometimes set up. The hands of the contracting parties were cut with a sharp stone, the blood from their hands was put upon the stones that had been set up, and the god was invoked to witness the treaty or contract between the parties.

These sacred stones, used for purposes of worship, were called among the Arabs *manzab*, and an individual stone was

called *nuzub*, the former being the collective of the latter. East of the Jordan and in the Jordan valley not a few evidences of this stone worship have been found, and occasionally a *gilgal*, or rude circle of stones. Some remains of this particular form of stone worship have been found also west of the Jordan valley, in Palestine proper. Such was the group of stones over or about which a temple was built at Tel es-Safi, supposed to be the ancient Gath, excavated by Dr. Bliss for the Palestine Exploration Fund. Here, in a temple, and partly embedded in its walls, were found some six conical stones, an ancient *gilgal*, a shrine of the primitive inhabitants. One is tempted to think that there may have been originally seven stones instead of six, as we find to have been the case at times with the Arabs, and as was apparently the case at the well of Beer-sheba, so sacred in the earlier Hebrew times. This rude shrine at Gath was, like the primitive Arabian shrines, a few sacred stones under the open heaven not covered by any building. At a later date, it would seem, a temple took the place of the earlier rude open-air shrine or sanctuary, and some of the stones of the *gilgal* were built into the walls of the temple. We find a somewhat similar method employed in the case of at least one Babylonian temple, where a sacred stone, or baitylion was built into the temple wall. Such stones represented a ruder and more primitive type of worship. This ruder type of stone worship had, in general, given way in Babylonia at a very early date to a more ornate religion, with images of gods and goddesses and highly decorated shrines. Yet the sanctity of the ancient stones was such that here and there they survived, inclosed within walls, or even embedded in the wall, but too ancient and too sacred to be entirely done away with. One is reminded of the persistence of the ancient stone worship among the Mohammedan Arabians in the supreme sanctity of the *caaba* at Mecca. Mohammed either did not feel himself strong enough to abolish the worship of this stone, or else he was himself in regard to it under the spell of ancestral custom, so that while he did away with other idolatrous practices of the same sort, he yet preserved the

caaba, and allowed it to remain as the central sanctuary and most sacred object of Islam.

The Bible shows us that in the earlier times stone pillars, stone circles, etc., used in connexion with the worship and religious rites, both of Canaanites and Israelites, were common all over the land. Taking up the Book of Joshua, we find that the first headquarters established by the Israelites west of the Jordan were at a place called *Gilgal*, that is, a circle of stones. According to the account in Joshua iv., this circle was erected by the Israelites themselves, who took twelve stones out of the Jordan and set them up there; and in chapter v. we have an interpretation of the name *gilgal* (circle) given as the rolling away of the reproach of the Egyptians from off the Israelites by the circumcision at that place. The prophets tell us that this *gilgal*, or circle of stones, was in their day regarded as a sanctuary of peculiar holiness, to which people made pilgrimages. But this was not the only *gilgal* west of Jordan. There is at least one other place of this name mentioned in the Old Testament, and probably two. One of these *gilgals* was in the neighbourhood of Bethel, in the mountains of central Israel, where we find a place called Gilgiliya existing to-day. Another, mentioned in Joshua xii. 23, as in the neighbourhood of Dor, is called to-day Gilgulie. Besides these two *gilgals* on the west side of Jordan, the Bible mentions a *gilgal*, called also a *mazzebah*, or collection of stones, in Gilead. This *gilgal*, or *mazzebah*, was erected, according to Genesis xxxi. 45-54, by Jacob. He sacrificed at it, and made there a covenant with Laban. It will be seen that this was precisely the same sort of thing which the ancient Arabs made use of in connexion with their covenants, as described above, and the word *mazzebah*, which we find here and frequently in the Old Testament, is the same word as the Arabic *manzab*, which, as we have seen, was used as the name for these stones. Not only that; the Bible also tells us that in the earlier days the Hebrews did actually sacrifice at such stones, pouring the blood upon them or at their feet in precisely the same way as the Arabs did.

It must be said, first of all, that among the Arabs any killing of animals for food was sacrifice. The blood must be given to God, after which the flesh might be eaten by the worshippers. To-day, among the Moslem Arabs, the word for killing an animal is *zebach*, sacrifice. Even when a gazelle is shot it may not be eaten until the blood has first been carefully poured out—a survival of the old custom of giving the blood to God, the flesh alone belonging to the worshippers. The same word *zebach* was used by the Hebrews to denote killing, or sacrifice, and in Leviticus xvii., for example, we find it specially provided that the blood of any animal which is slain must be given to God before the animal may be eaten, while in the case of wild animals killed far from the altar the blood must be poured out and covered with earth, very much as among the Arabs.

In 1 Samuel xiv. 32-35 we have the account of something which might have taken place, except for the name of God there used, among any tribe of Arabians before the time of Mohammed. The people, an hungered after their victory over the Philistines, commenced to slay and eat. Saul was horrified because they were killing and eating without recognition of God. That was sacrilege, an invasion of the Divine prerogative. Accordingly he set up a stone, and made them kill the animals at the stone, pouring out their blood on or by it, and of this stone it is said: "It was the first altar that he built unto Yahaweh." Here we have an example of sacrificing at a rude stone, after the same fashion as the Arabs used. When the Hebrews entered Canaan they were already familiar with this use of sacred stones in connexion with worship, and on the other hand they found the people everywhere through the land of Canaan making use of stones to indicate the presence of the god. No shrine was complete unless by it there stood a stone. This practice, we learn from the Bible, the Israelites were not slow to adopt, and indeed, as already said, it was something with which they were familiar from the time of their wandering ancestors. When at Bethel (Gen. xxxi.) there was vouchsafed to Jacob a

vision of the angels of God ascending and descending upon a ladder (as our ordinary translation gives it, perhaps rather a terrace tower, like the Babylonian ziggurats), he set up there a stone and anointed it with oil. Oil and fat, be it said, came to take the place for anointing or pouring upon these stones which was taken, among the Arabs, by blood. The very name, Bethel, is suggestive of a sacred stone, or a baitylion, and the later narrative of the Bible shows us a very sacred shrine, with a sacred stone, or stones, existing at that place. Other especially sacred stones are described in the Bible as existing at Shechem, Mizpah, Gibeon, and Enrogel.

We find in the Bible, especially in the Prophets, constant mention of the pillars which were set up by the altars at which the Canaanites and Israelites sacrificed throughout the land. Now the word "pillar" in our English Bible is the translation of the Hebrew *mazzebah*. This, as we have seen, was the sacred stone which, in the most primitive times, was the representative of God, and as such received the blood of the sacrifice. But at a later time we find prophets denouncing these pillars and demanding their destruction, and finally, in the time of Josiah, when the high places all over the country are done away with, these stones also are destroyed. But long before the days of the prophets, even among the Canaanites, the *mazzebah* had ceased to play the rôle which it played among the Arabs, as both the representative of God and also, in a sense, the altar on which the blood was poured. At the Canaanite and Israelite high places there was, in addition to the *mazzebah*, an altar. Sacrifice no longer consisted in merely pouring out the blood on the stone which stood for God, and eating the flesh. Fire had come to be used in the sacrifice, and a part of the flesh belonged to the Deity or His representatives, in addition to the blood. Nevertheless, the stones or pillars continued to be, in a sense, the representatives of the Deity, and at the sacrifice blood was always smeared upon them.

Now it is not surprising to find that, in the course of their religious development, the Israelites adopted a certain number

of heathen forms and symbols, some of which, in the process of the spiritualisation of religion, they afterwards discarded. Sometimes such forms dropped out almost unnoticed ; sometimes there was a fierce struggle. So it has been in the later history of the development of the Christian religion. We find in the story of the conversion of the heathen to Christianity much strange commingling of heathen feasts, and rites, and beliefs with Christian. Sometimes these heathen uses were sloughed off as Christianity matured. Sometimes they formed the centre of struggle, and gave rise to cruel wars and bloody persecutions. In particular localities, among Christians, a sacred stone has assumed a place of supreme importance as the representation of God or the power of God, precisely as the ancient black stone of Mecca, the *caaba*, became such a sacred representation to Islam. In pre-Reformation times there was such a stone at Dresden, enshrined in a church, and receiving the worship and adoration of numerous Christian pilgrims in that so-called Christian land. At the Reformation this black stone of Dresden, with many other heathen survivals of the same description, was abolished. In Hebrew history we find, at the time of Josiah, a reformation strikingly similar to our own Reformation of the sixteenth century ; and to carry the parallel further, in the reign of Hezekiah, some seventy-five years earlier, began an intellectual and religious awakening, preparing the way for Josiah's movement, similar to the Renaissance of the fifteenth century, which, in the history of Europe, prepared the way for the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

A little before the time of Hezekiah, in the time of Amos, we find Gilgal and Beersheba, both of them places where sacred stones had been set up, referred to as shrines held in high honour by the people ; and Amos and the prophets who followed him testify that sacred stones stood at all the altars where Yahaweh was worshipped throughout the country. Indeed, when Isaiah wishes to speak of the glorious days to come, when the worship of the Lord shall extend beyond the bounds of Israel, so that a place of worship to Him shall be

found in Egypt also, he speaks of setting up a pillar, or *mazzebah*, there. "In that day shall there be an altar to Yahaweh in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a *mazzebah* at the border thereof to Yahaweh" (Isa. xix. 19). He cannot think of the worship of Yahaweh without the accompaniment of the sacred stone or pillar.

With King Josiah comes the recognition by the religious leaders of the people that such things are gross and material, and hindrances to the true spiritual worship of God. Prophets denounce them, and reformers break them in pieces. One might show how this spiritualising process goes on, still further helped by the Exile, so that finally not only pillars and other similar representations of God disappear, but even the sacred Ark and the *Urim* and *Thummim*, the lots which the priests used to cast, in the days of Saul and David, before the ephod or before the Ark, to determine the will of God.

With Christ we come to a still more advanced spirituality, where the Temple itself is robbed of its sanctity, the veil is rent in twain, and the spiritual indwelling of God in man takes the place of the material Temple, with its dark Holy of Holies, the representation of the abiding-place of God among men. It is a slow process of education, from the rude stones, such as stood on the hill at es-Safi, where a primitive people worshipped its God, up through the Philistine or Canaanite temple, with its altar and its pillars sacred to the Baal, or master of the land ; through the Israelite adoption of this shrine as its place of worship and the identification of its Lord, Yahaweh, with the Baal, or master of that region, and its use in His worship of many of the terms and practices with which the Canaanite Baal had been worshipped there ; on through the period of reformation, when such shrines, with their altars and their pillars, were destroyed, and their priests gathered together, so far as might be, at Jerusalem, to worship Yahaweh there in the one great Temple, where His presence was represented in the dark Holy of Holies by the Ark, and by the cherubim ; on through the destruction of that Temple and the disappearance of Ark and cherubim ;

through the exile in Babylonia, where the people were compelled to worship God without outward symbol or indication of His presence, and even without sacrifice ; on, once more, through the period of the new Temple, where God was worshipped again with the sacrifice of bulls and oxen, and where the place of His special presence was indicated by a dark inner chamber, but without Ark or cherubim ; up to the culmination of this development from materialism into spiritualism, when the veil was rent in twain, and God declared to reside in no temple made by hands, neither in Jerusalem, nor yet in Samaria, and the sacrifice of bulls, and goats, and sheep, and doves was done away with for ever, spiritual sacrifice and spiritual service being substituted therefor.

shipped God at the holy place where Moses' father-in-law was priest. In point of fact, the religious ideas of the Hebrews, before the time of Moses, were substantially the same as those of the Arabians before the time of Mohammed, as is shown by a comparison of the Bible references to ancient Hebrew customs and practices with the customs and practices of the pre-Mohammedan Arabians.

But with all this I am not concerned at present, except only to say that the Bible constantly indicates the methods of God to be of this nature: He teaches man through that which man has learned from his own experience and the experience of those who went before him; teaches him in the beginning through forms and methods which seem to us of a later age strange and barbarous, because we have advanced so far; teaches him through things which shall afterwards be laid aside when they have served their purpose. And so the revelation through Moses is not an entirely new thing, any more than the revelation through Christ. It attaches itself to what had gone before, but puts into it a new spirit and a new life. Many of the forms and practices of the religion of Moses' time were destined to drop away at a later date, just as in the case of Christianity it was found necessary, in course of time, to drop the Jewish rites and ceremonies which were at first made use of in the Christian Church.

This story of Moses, as we find it in the Bible, shows us a certain connexion with Egypt, but not necessarily an intimate acquaintance with Egyptian religion or with Egyptian civilisation. The Hebrews, according to the Old Testament account, lived in Egypt, separate from the Egyptians, maintaining their own customs and rites, and rejecting everything Egyptian. In the later civilisation of Israel we find nothing that can be referred to Egypt. Outside of the deliverance from Egyptian bondage, the remembrance of which played a great part in the making of the people of Israel, there is nothing in their culture which attaches itself to Egypt until long after the Babylonian exile. For a long time, therefore,

it seemed to me improbable that Moses or the Israelites had derived anything of their religion from Egypt. But there is one thing, and that of the first importance, which I have at last been forced to conclude may be, and seemingly must be, connected with the influence of Egyptian religion upon Moses.

I have already said that the gods of the Arabians were localised, and a study of Hebrew literature shows that this ancient idea of the god as inhabiting a locality was strong in Israel also. So when Elijah would seek the presence of Yahaweh, the God of Israel, he travels to Horeb (1 Kings xix. 8). Deborah sings (Judges v. 4) that Yahaweh's habitation is in Seir, which is the same as Horeb, and that He comes thence to lead the armies of Israel to victory against their heathen foes. So also Habakkuk (iii. 3) sings that Yahaweh's dwelling is in Paran or Teman, which is again the same place as Seir or Horeb.

Now it was necessary that the Israelites should advance beyond this stage of localising God in Horeb, or else, entering Palestine, they would gradually cease to be worshippers of God—Yahaweh, Whose dwelling was at Sinai or at Horeb—and would become worshippers of the gods of the land into which they had entered. However much they might think of Horeb or Sinai as the original home of their God, in some form He must go with them into Palestine. In the new religion given by Moses this continuing presence of Yahaweh was provided for through the Ark.

The Ark is unlike anything which we find among the Arabians, and indeed there are only two analogies which seem fairly available for comparison. In Egypt representations of the gods were carried about in ships. Originally capable of navigating the Nile and its canals, these ships were finally so reduced in size that they could be carried on the shoulders of men. In the cabin or box occupying the central part of the ship was some representation of the Deity, but precisely what in any given case we do not know, as the cabin or

box was kept carefully covered up and its contents concealed from view.

In Babylonia there were god-ships of a similar character. These also seem to have been carried on the shoulders of men, but we have no representations of them. At a later date the ship developed into a box, carried by poles passed through rings on the sides. On the Assyrian bas-reliefs these boxes are represented as without covers, and small figures of the gods stand in them looking out over the sides. It is possible that this is a mere artistic convention to show what were the contents of the box, and that in reality the box was covered and the images of the gods invisible. But at least it shows that the Assyrian did not exercise that extreme care to prevent the interior from being seen which we find in the case of the Egyptian god-ships. Finally we find a litter substituted for the box, and the god seated upon a throne on this litter, which is carried by poles on the shoulders of men.

Was the Hebrew Ark suggested by the ships or boxes used in Egypt or in Babylonia to carry the gods in procession? It seems to me that such was the case, and until recently I had supposed that the suggestion came from Babylonia; that the Ark was a tradition from the ancient times when the ancestors of the Hebrews were in close connexion with Babylonia. But the difficulties connected with this view are very great, and I am now inclined to suggest that the idea came from Egypt, and that in the Ark we have an evidence of information possessed by Moses with regard at least to certain of the salient features of Egyptian religious practices.

The name Moses is of doubtful origin. No altogether satisfactory etymology of it has been given. Sayce supposed that he had found the word in Assyrian. Some of the best scholars to-day consider it Egyptian, and compare with it such Egyptian names as *Thutmosis*, *Ahmosis*, and the like. The Septuagint Greek translators of the Old Testament were of the same opinion as to its Egyptian origin. Aaron and Miriam also are claimed by some as Egyptian, and the name of Phinehas, the high priest, the son of Aaron, does actually

seem to be Egyptian. I should not like, however, to base anything upon these Egyptian etymologies, but only to call attention to the possibility that these names are Egyptian.

Another point seems to me of much greater importance. The contents of the ship or box in Egypt and Babylonia were representations of the Deity, in one case certainly by images and in the other probably. But the contents of the Hebrew Ark were two tables of stone containing the Decalogue. The direct narratives of Exodus and Deuteronomy with regard to the contents of the Ark are confirmed by the indirect evidence contained in its name, for from the very earliest time onward, as we learn from the Books of Samuel, one designation of the Ark was "Ark of the Covenant."

Now we have as yet found no traces in Babylonia of the existence of a sacred law. In Egypt, on the other hand, such a law did exist. We have not, it is true, found the law itself, but we have found sufficient evidence of its existence. Chapter cxxv. of the Book of the Dead contains the justification of the dead in the lower world. The dead states—

"I have not done so and so,
I have not done so and so,
I have not done so and so,"

through a long and varying number of negations. But these negations suppose the existence of a law forbidding the things enumerated. It is not necessary to suppose that that law was written out in all its details. Possibly it may have been an oral instruction throughout, but, as the different copies of chapter cxxv. of the Book of the Dead show, it was certainly a constant quantity in its main prescriptions. Moreover, it was recognised as a sacred, God-given law, which it was incumbent upon every one to keep. This law contains, as we know from the negations in the Book of the Dead, substantially the entire second part of our Decalogue—"Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery," etc. It had, therefore, a high ethical character; but, on the other hand, these ethical prescriptions were mixed in with matter of a ritual,

non-ethical, and often trivial character, the great moral commandments and the most insignificant ritual prescriptions being placed on the same footing side by side.

The relation between this sacred religious law of the Egyptians and the Hebrew Decalogue may be described as something the same as the relation of the Lord's Prayer to the teachings of the rabbins. It has often been pointed out that the petitions of the Lord's Prayer may all be found here and there among the teachings of the Jewish rabbins. What makes that prayer so wonderful is that it takes just the great and high things, leaving out all that is insignificant and trivial. It is its inspiration to do this which places it above any prayer that man has ever uttered.

My suggestion, then, is that Moses was acquainted with the wisdom of Egypt, in so far that he knew the practice of carrying the god in a ship-box, and was acquainted with at least the main features of the sacred religious law, on the observance of which the future happiness of the Egyptian was supposed to depend.

And now a word about the use of the Ark among the Hebrews. It differed from the use of the ship or box among the Egyptians and Babylonians, as their conditions differed. In the case of both these nations the gods had settled abodes —temples, and the ships were used merely to transport them about the country, that they might see and bless it, or to convey them from temple to temple in connexion with certain feasts. But the Ark of the Israelites had at first no temple in which to dwell. Its covering was a tent, and where the Ark and its tent were, there was God. So when the Ark was taken out they said (Num. x. 35), "Rise up, Yahaweh, and let Thine enemies be scattered; and let them that hate Thee flee before Thee." And when it came back they said (36), "Return, Yahaweh, unto the ten thousand thousands of Israel." In the Book of Samuel we read that the Ark was carried out to battle, in order that Yahaweh might fight with and for His people. This use continued certainly until and during the time of David. After David's time the Ark passes

out of sight. We are told that it was placed in the Holy of Holies of Solomon's Temple, which was the especial abode of Yahaweh. Whether or not it was ever brought out for any purpose we do not know. The Bible is silent, and it is generally assumed that the Ark was henceforward stationary. God, Yahaweh, was now localised in the Temple at Jerusalem, and especially in the Holy of Holies in that Temple. That the Ark continued to play an important part in the religion of the people of Jerusalem up to the Exile we may conjecture, however, from a reference in the Book of Jeremiah (Jer. iii. 16), "They shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of Yahaweh: neither shall it come to mind: neither shall they remember it; neither shall they visit it." It is clear from this that the Ark of the Covenant of Yahaweh was considered an especial representative of the presence of Yahaweh and a guarantee of His protection, and that in the time of Jeremiah it played some part in the ritual. Jeremiah, after his fashion with regard to all externals, holds it light, and declares that the time shall come when it will be done away with, and no one will think of it any more. That time came with the Exile. The Ark was destroyed. It had done its work, and that a very important work. Its use and purpose had been to carry God for the Israelites from Sinai and Horeb into Palestine. Without the Ark, Israel entering Palestine would soon have forsaken Yahaweh its God, and become a worshipper of the gods of the land. It preserved among the people a consciousness of the presence of Yahaweh. By means of the two tables of the commandments which were in it, it held up to the Israelites the thought of a God of ethical law. But the time came when the tables of stone on which the Law was written, with the Ark which contained them, might have become a mere fetich, reverenced for their antiquity and regarded as being themselves practically God. This outward must be done away with, the Law of God must be graven, as Jeremiah said, on the hearts of men, and God known as residing not in the Ark or by the Ark, but with His people everywhere.

Moses made an immense step forward in religion when, by the inspiration of God, he gave the Israelites the Ark and its tables of stone. But the day came when, if the Israelites were to advance further Godward, the Ark must be destroyed. Its destruction was another step on the Godward path which was to bring man at last face to face with the omnipresent God, without temple, without ark, and without tables of stone.

CHAPTER XV

THE BOOK OF DANIEL

ON grounds of internal evidence the Book of Daniel was ascribed to the time of Antiochus IV. (B.C. 173-164), even before archaeological discoveries in Babylonia and Persia had placed in our hands contemporary records of the kings of Babylon and Persia mentioned in that book. Those discoveries have, however, played so great a part in confirming the literary and historical evidence that I have placed this discussion of the problems of the Book of Daniel in the section devoted more particularly to Archaeology and the Bible.

It is now generally admitted that the Book of Daniel was composed somewhere in the period B.C. 168-164. In general the arguments for this date are as follows:—

1. In the Jewish canon Daniel stands, not among the Prophets, but in the Writings or Hagiographa, and toward the very end of those Writings, immediately after Esther and before the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. The force of this argument will be appreciated by reference to the first chapter of this volume, on the English Bible.

2. While Jesus Ben-Sirach, who wrote somewhere between B.C. 290 and 190, mentions Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve Prophets, he does not refer to Daniel.

3. In Daniel ix. 2 reference is made to a collection of sacred books in which, from the context, it is clear that the Book of Jeremiah was included. As the Prophets were not collected as sacred books before, at the earliest, the third century B.C.,

this reference would imply a time of composition as late as or later than that date.

4. The evidence of language shows that the book must have been written after the commencement of the Greek period. The Hebrew, in which part of the book is composed, is of a corrupted and late form. The Aramaic, in which the other half of the book is composed, is a Western Aramaic dialect, akin to that spoken in and about Palestine, and late, not early. There are a number of Persian words used in the book, indicating corruption of the language by contact with the Persians, and a few Greek names for musical instruments, one of which, *psanterin*, is clearly the Greek *psalterion*, with the substitution of *n* for *l*, a Macedonian dialect peculiarity, indicating that the word was borrowed from the Macedonian conquerors.

5. The use of the name *Chaldean* to signify not a people or a nation, but a caste of wise men.

6. Historical inaccuracies and peculiarities, as (*a*) the use of Nebuchadnezzar for Nebuchadrezzar; (*b*) the story of the seven years' insanity of Nebuchadnezzar; (*c*) the statement that this Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem and carried away some of the sacred vessels in the third year of Jehoiakim (Daniel i. 1, 2); (*d*) the statement that Belshazzar was the last king of Babylonia and Nebuchadrezzar his father, whereas we know from the records that Nabonidus, a man in no wise related to Nebuchadrezzar, was the last king of Babylonia (he had a son, Belsarusur, who had apparently become the king Belshazzar of Daniel); (*e*) the statement that Darius the Mede, son of Ahasuerus, became, after the death of Belshazzar, "king over the realm of the Chaldeans," whereas we know from the records that Cyrus succeeded Nabonidus, and was in turn succeeded by Cambyses, he by Pseudo-Smerdis, and he by Darius Hystaspis, a Persian; (*f*) there are further historical inaccuracies, which I shall not endeavour to point out here in detail, with regard to the Median, Babylonian, and Persian kingdoms, the order of succession of which is confused, and the names and succession of the Persian kings.

7. The above arguments would go to show that the book was not written during the Captivity and the beginning of the Persian period immediately succeeding the Captivity, but at a period following the conquest of Persia by Alexander the Great. But within this period we are able to fix the date still more exactly from historical allusions in the book. The various visions contained in the Book of Daniel deal with a period closing some time in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. So, in the second chapter, Nebuchadnezzar's dream, and the seventh chapter, Daniel's dream, in the first year of Belshazzar, we have a view of history from the Chaldean or Babylonian empire of Nebuchadnezzar on to the time of the Seleucidæ. First we have the Chaldean empire; then, according to the peculiar history of the Book of Daniel, the Median, then the Persian, and then the Macedonian. In the second chapter, Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the statue, there proceeds out of the Macedonian kingdom a divided kingdom, part of iron and part of clay, representing the divisions of Alexander's Macedonian empire between the Seleucidæ and the Ptolemies. The seventh chapter, the dream of the four great beasts, carries this history down somewhat further. Out of the Macedonian empire arise ten new kingdoms, represented by ten horns, among which comes up another little horn that roots out three kingdoms, etc. Here we have clearly an allusion to Antiochus IV.

In the eighth chapter the Medes and Persians are represented as a sort of dual empire under the figure of the two-horned ram, one horn representing the Medes and the other the Persians. The ram is overturned by a he-goat from the West, with a horn between his eyes, representing Alexander the Great. Out of this horn came in time four horns toward the four winds of heaven, and out of them a little horn, which took away the continual burnt offering and cast down the place of the sanctuary. The reference is clearly to the profanation of the sanctuary at Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes in B.C. 168.

The twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh verses of the ninth

chapter give us somewhat further details. They contain references to the deposition of the high priest Onias, in B.C. 175, his assassination, in B.C. 172, the profanation of the sanctuary, in B.C. 168, with the cessation of sacrifice and oblation, and apparently, also, the purification of the altar, in B.C. 165.

The tenth and following chapters enter much further into historical details covering the same general period. For the earlier part of that period the references are vague and incorrect. The writer knows of only four Persian kings, successors of Darius the Mede (xi. 2). As we proceed, however, the history becomes more accurate and detailed, until at last, at the close of the first or the beginning of the second century B.C., it becomes a chronological record of great historical value, recounting the relations of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kings and their wars for the possession of Palestine. In xi. 18 there is an allusion to the victory of the Roman Consul, Lucius Scipio, over Antiochus III., at Magnesia, in B.C. 190; in verse 30 to the order of Popilius Laenas, speaking in behalf of the Roman Senate to Antiochus Epiphanes, to leave Egypt, in B.C. 168. Then follow a number of verses giving an account of the persecution of the Jewish religion by Antiochus and the actions and views of the latter, which agree, in general, with the representations of the First Book of Maccabees, ending with a notice of Antiochus' death, in verse 45. But the notice of his death is not in accordance with historical fact. He is here represented as pitching his tents in Palestine, between Jerusalem and the Mediterranean Sea, and, apparently, dying there, whereas we know that he died in an expedition against Labæ, in the East. The further representations of this particular prophecy, contained in chapter xii., are cast in vague and general terms. The natural conclusion would seem to be that the writer was unfamiliar, except from vague and inaccurate tradition, with the history of the period preceding the Alexandrian conquest; and that, on the other hand, he had a personal and accurate acquaintance with the history of the times of Antiochus III. and IV. up to about B.C. 165; that at that point his knowledge ceased.

Accordingly, the composition of the book, or at least of the final apocalypse of the book, may be assigned to the year B.C. 165 or the beginning of the year 164—that is, very shortly before the time of the death of Antiochus IV.

8. Further arguments might be presented from the theology of the book and from its relation to the books preceding and following it. It is the first book in which we have an expression of the belief in the resurrection of the dead. It represents a comparatively developed angelology, which we do not find in any preceding book, but the beginnings of which we may observe in the visions of the post-Exilic prophet Zechariah. It is in the prophecies of this latter prophet, also, that we find the beginnings of the apocalyptic method, which meets us fully developed in the books of Daniel and Enoch, the earlier portion of which last-named book is commonly ascribed to the commencement of the second century B.C. From this time onward, well into the Christian era, we have an abundance of apocalypses, and apocalyptic writing takes the place vacated by the cessation of prophecy.

But as the object of this chapter is rather to deal with the Book of Daniel in the light of modern archaeological discoveries, I shall pass on to a consideration of some of the historical peculiarities of the book in comparison with the Persian inscriptions.

As already indicated, history is strangely turned about and confused in the Book of Daniel. A curious example of this confusion we find in the relation of the conquest of Belshazzar by Darius. According to the Book of Daniel, Nebuchadrezzar was succeeded by his son Belshazzar, and Belshazzar was conquered and slain by "Darius the Mede." Now no Belshazzar son of Nebuchadrezzar ever reigned in Babylon, and the only Darius who can possibly be intended by the designation "Darius the Mede" is Darius Hystaspis, who was not an almost immediate successor of Nebuchadrezzar, but was separated from him by several reigns; neither was it he who overthrew the Babylonian empire and established

the rule of the “Medes and Persians.” Nebuchadrezzar was succeeded by Evil-Merodach, he by Neriglissar, he by Labashi-Marduk, and he by Nabonidus, who was overthrown by Cyrus. Cyrus was succeeded by Cambyses, he by Pseudo-Smerdis, and he by Darius. It is difficult, at first sight certainly, to understand how in the stories contained in the Book of Daniel history can have become so confused as to bring Darius into such close proximity to Nebuchadrezzar, and to make him the conqueror of Babylon in the time of Nebuchadrezzar’s son. Some light is thrown upon this difficulty by Darius’ Behistun inscription. In that inscription (l. 31 ff.) we read this account of a revolt against Darius in Babylon:—

“Further there was a Babylonian, Nidintubel his name, son of Aniri, who rebelled in Babylon, lying to the people, and saying, ‘I am Nebuchadrezzar son of Nabonidus.’ Then all the Babylonians went over to that Nidintubel, Babylon rebelled, he made himself king over Babylon. . . . Thus saith Darius the king: Then I marched to Babylon and against that Nidintubel who called himself Nebuchadrezzar. The army of Nidintubel was placed upon ships; the shores of the Tigris they occupied.”

The next two lines are not altogether intelligible in detail, but state in general that Darius forced the passage of the Tigris and defeated the army of Nidintubel.

“On the 26th day of the month Kisleu we delivered battle. Thus saith Darius the king: Then I marched toward Babylon. I had not yet reached Babylon when Nidintubel, who had said, ‘I am Nebuchadrezzar,’ marched against me with an army to deliver battle, to a city named Zazanu on the shore of the Euphrates. There we joined battle. Ormuzd was my strong helper; by the grace of Ormuzd I smote the army of Nidintubel. One part was driven into the water, and the water swept them away. We joined battle on the second day of the month Anamaka. Thus saith Darius the king: Then

this Nidintubel with a few mounted soldiers came to Babylon. Then I came to Babylon. By the help of Ormuzd I took Babylon and captured Nidintubel; and I slew Nidintubel in Babylon."

Further on in the same inscription (l. 84 ff.) Darius describes another revolt against himself of the Babylonians, in which again the pretender to the throne claimed to be Nebuchadrezzar son of Nabonidus.

"Thus saith Darius the king: While I was in Persia and Media the Babylonians revolted against me for a second time. A man named Arakhu, an Armenian, son of Haldita, arose against me. There is in Babylonia a district named Dubala. From this place he arose against me. He deceived the people of Babylon, saying, 'I am Nebuchadrezzar son of Nabonidus.' Thereupon the people of Babylon rebelled against me and went over to this Arakhu. He took Babylon: he became king in Babylon. Thus saith Darius the king: Then I sent an army to Babylon. Vindastra, a Mede, my servant, I made commander; I sent him out, saying, 'Go thither and smite the army of the rebels.' Ormuzd brought me help; by the grace of Ormuzd Vindastra took Babylon and smote the army of Babylon, the rebels, and took them captive."

In l. 90 ff. he mentions in succession the various pretenders who rebelled against him at one time or another. Gomates, a Magian, who claimed to be Bardes son of Cyrus; Ashina, who raised a revolt in Elam; Nidintubel, a Babylonian, who claimed to be Nebuchadrezzar son of Nabonidus, and who made himself king of Babylon; Martes, a Persian, who led a rebellion in Elam; Phraortes, a Median, who claimed to be Xathrites, of the race of Cyaxares, and who raised Media against Darius; Sitrantachmes, a Sagartian, who also claimed to be a descendant of Cyaxares and raised part of the same country on much the same grounds as the preceding; Parada, a Margian, who led a rebellion in Margu; Veisdates, a Persian, who claimed to be Bardes son of Cyrus and raised

a rebellion in Persia ; and Arakhu, an Armenian, who claimed to be Nebuchadrezzar son of Nabonidus and raised a revolt in Babylon. It is worthy of note that both pretenders to the throne in Babylon make use of the name Nebuchadrezzar, although according to Darius each claimed also to be the son of Nabonidus. It is clear that Nebuchadrezzar was the name to conjure by in Babylonia, so that when a man sought to raise a revolt he laid claim to this name as a sure means of arousing popular sentiment in his favour. This may serve to show us that that confusion of Babylonian history in the Book of Daniel which sets chronology at nought and gathers everything about the name of Nebuchadrezzar was not altogether an invention of later Jewish legends, but that it had its origin in the popular ideas of the Babylonians themselves.

In addition to the record of the two pretenders named Nebuchadrezzar contained in the Behistun inscription, we have also some contract tablets from the reign of one or the other of these two pretenders, presumably the first. In the fourth volume of Schrader's *Sammlung von assyrischen und babylonischen Texten* are given three of these documents from the reign of "Nebuchadrezzar III.," of which two are dated in "the accession year of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon," and one in "the first year of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon." The names of the members of the Egibi family mentioned in these tablets are the evidence that they do not belong to the reign of Nebuchadrezzar II., but to that of Nebuchadrezzar III.

It may be worth noting in connexion with the dates of these tablets, which give us for the duration of the reign of this Nebuchadrezzar III. portions at least of two years, that at the close of the third book of his history Herodotus describes the revolt of Babylon and its siege by Darius for a period of a little more than twenty months. After he had taken the city he treated it, according to Herodotus, with great severity, in striking contrast with the treatment it had received from Cyrus, dismantling its fortifications, and

endeavouring to destroy for ever its capacity to do mischief. This siege naturally impressed itself upon the popular imagination more strongly than the almost friendly capture of the city by Cyrus, and hence in folk-history Darius, and not Cyrus, became the conqueror of Babylon. It is this folk-history which is perpetuated in the Book of Daniel.

Precisely why Belshazzar should play such an important part in the story I cannot conjecture. All the information which we possess regarding him up to the present is very little. We know that Nabonidus had a son of this name, and he seems to have played a rôle of importance, otherwise his name would not have been substituted in the tradition represented in the Book of Daniel for that of Nabonidus, as it evidently has been, adding one more element of confusion to those already existing. In the folk-history of the Book of Daniel, then, Belshazzar has taken the place of Nabonidus, for reasons which we do not know. He is made the son of Nebuchadrezzar, because Nebuchadrezzar was the great king of Babylon, whose name every one knew, and about whom every one was grouped in the thought of the people. Darius Hystaspis takes the place of Cyrus as conqueror of Babylon, because of his capture of the city in the war against Nebuchadrezzar III., a siege and capture which impressed the popular mind much more forcibly than that of Cyrus. Why he is called the Mede I do not know.

Another instance of folk-history in the Book of Daniel is the story of the three children in the fiery furnace, recounted in Daniel iii. It is a matter of surprise to me that I have never seen this story brought into conjunction with Jeremiah xxix. 22. Turning to the latter passage, we read that Jeremiah addressed a letter to the captive Jews in Babylonia, bidding them to build houses and dwell in them; and to plant gardens and eat the fruits thereof; to take wives and beget sons and daughters; and to take wives and husbands for their sons and daughters, so that they might also have sons and daughters. He bids them to seek the peace of the land where they are, and not to listen to the prophets and diviners among them,

and tells them, "After seventy years be accomplished for Babylon, I will visit you and perform My good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place." Then he mentions by name Ahab, son of Kolaiah, and Zedekiah, son of Maaseiah, who have evidently been stirring up the Jews in Babylonia to revolt against Nebuchadrezzar, saying that they are prophesying a lie, and that Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, shall slay them, and that they shall become a byword to all the captives of Judah who there are in Babylon, saying, "the Lord make thee like Zedekiah and like Ahab, whom the king of Babylon roasted in the fire."

What put into Jeremiah's head the idea that these men would be punished in such a manner? The fact that Nebuchadrezzar was known to have made use before of this form of punishment? Giesebricht, in his commentary on Jeremiah, refers to "similar Persian customs," and I suppose it probable that this barbarous method of punishment by burning can be established as practised in that and surrounding countries at various times. But, however that may be, the fact that this statement in Jeremiah's letter was preserved and has been handed down to us may fairly be regarded as evidence that this was no idle wish of Jeremiah, but that this punishment was actually inflicted upon these two prophets, Ahab and Zedekiah.

Now it must be remembered that the position which these two men represented was the so-called patriotic position of that day, while that of Jeremiah was the so-called unpatriotic position. He was often in a minority of one or two in advocating the policy of submission. He was regarded by the bulk of his compatriots as a Babylonian sympathiser, if not as an actual traitor; and the Babylonians, on their part, seem to have regarded him as a sort of secret ally, so that after the capture of Jerusalem he was treated by them with marked honour.

The Book of Daniel made over again for a special purpose traditions which had come down, sometimes in a very confused form, from an earlier period. It seems to me that in

the story contained in the third chapter of Daniel, of the three children, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who were cast into the fiery furnace and miraculously saved, we have the legendary account of Nebuchadrezzar's treatment of Ahab and Zedekiah, or some of their compeers. It has come down to us through the medium of the popular, patriotic party, the party opposed by Jeremiah, but the party which was both the most numerous and the most influential in his time.

One of the problems which meets us in the Book of Daniel, on which it has been supposed that Assyriology might throw some light, is the interpretation of the *Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin*, of Daniel v. 25. Nöldeke, Hofmann, Ganneau, and Prince have endeavoured to explain these words from the Assyrian. It should be clear, from the mistakes in Babylonian names and in the interpretation of those names in the Book of Daniel, that the writer of that book had no acquaintance with the Babylonian language or the cuneiform script. Attention has already been called to the incorrect form *Nebuchadnezzar* instead of *Nebuchadrezzar*. In Daniel iv. 8 the name Belteshazzar is incorrectly interpreted as containing in composition the name of the god Bel. It is clearly the Babylonian Belatsu-Usur, which means, "May his life be preserved," the word Belatsu, "his life," having nothing whatever to do with the name Bel. The outward similarity has misled the writer, who was evidently unfamiliar with Babylonian. More curious is the name Abed-nego, which is clearly an error for Abed-nebo, "servant of Nebo." In its present distorted form it makes no sense.

It is not a comparison with the Babylonian which gives us the clue to the meaning of Daniel v. 25, but the text itself. In the explanation of these words, given in verses 26-28, we find simply *Mene, Tekel, Peres*. Turning to the Greek text, we find that in verse 25 we have not *Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin*, but as in the Hebrew of verses 26-28, *Mene, Tekel, Peres*. The combined evidence of the Hebrew of verses 26-28 and the Greek version of verse 25 would

seem to render it almost self-evident that the Hebrew text of verse 25 is incorrect. The *Mene* in the Hebrew text seems to have been repeated by accident, and the *Peres* has either been inflected, or else we have the conjunction with the plural form of the word פְּרָסִי, "Persian." If the Greek text be adopted and the pointing of the words be omitted entirely, which is what the story itself requires, the whole passage becomes plain. We have two roots, meaning simply, *number* and *weigh*, and a third which may equally well mean *divide*, or *Persian*, an ambiguity that gives opportunity for the word play contained in the explanation. The problem given to Daniel is to explain what is meant by the three words on the wall, *number*, *weigh*, *divide*, or *Persian*. His skill or his inspiration is shown in the finding of a meaning which precisely fitted these three enigmatic roots to the circumstances. Remembering that the writing must have been without vowels, the conditions are very much the same as if we should have put before us the letters N-M-BR-W-G-H-D-V-D, except that in this case there is not in the last root the same opportunity for a play upon words as the Hebrew affords. The language used is, of course, Aramaic. Daniel interprets the meaning of the root *number* as, "God hath numbered thy kingdom, and brought it to an end." The root *weigh* he interprets to mean, "Thou art weighed in the balance, and found wanting." The third root, which might mean equally well *divide* or *Persian*, he interprets thus: "Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians."

It may be asked, Why could not the Chaldeans, soothsayers, and so forth read these letters? I do not understand that the text implies that they could not read the individual characters, but merely that they could not so read them as to make any sense out of them. "To read the writing and to make known its interpretation" (v. 8) are not two altogether different things, but either parts of the same thing, or at least most closely connected one with the other. This duplicate method of expression is characteristic of the style of the Book of Daniel throughout. The Chaldeans could not read the

letters in the sense that they could not read them so as to make any sense.

The untenability of Nöldeke's interpretation, and with it of the interpretation of Hofmann,¹ Prince, and Ganneau is set forth in a very few words and very effectively in Behrmann's commentary on the Book of Daniel.

One point which Nöldeke makes in his discussion of the subject is the use of the word פְּרָם, in what he regards as an unreal sense. He says: "With the first two words the simple sense 'number' and 'weigh' may do, but פְּרָם, 'divide,' is no longer in actual use, while the substantive פְּרָם, in the sense 'half-mina,' was still common among the later Jews." The context (*v. 28*) is the best evidence of the sense intended to be attached, and capable of being attached to the root letters פְּרָם. The word is used in the same sense in the Targum to 2 Kings iv. 39. It is true that this is not the common root for "divide," but its choice in this place is for the purpose of a play on words, since the same letters also mean "Persian." Nöldeke is driven to conjecture to account for the pointing in the forms פְּרָם and פְּרָקָל, words which we do not actually find pointed in this manner in any Semitic language in any sense. פְּנָמָן, on the other hand, is properly pointed as a participle passive of the Pe'al form of the verb פָּנָם, "number." Nöldeke says that this would be the correct absolute form for the Syriac word for *mina*; but however that may be, we do not actually find the word so pointed in the sense of *mina*, which he and the others above mentioned would give it. It is tempting to add to the possibilities of the sense of the words on the wall the further meaning *mina*, *shekel*, *half-shekel*, and the letters used are certainly capable of this further sense. On the other hand, the reading and explanation of the words in verses 26-28 make no allusion to such a sense, which would have been done, I think, had such an additional sense been intended. I am inclined to think, therefore, with Behrmann, that the tempting resemblance of

¹ *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, ii. 45-48.

these words to the words for *mina*, *shekel*, and *half-shekel* is due to accident.

The real difficulty in the passage is one of text corruption and of an erroneous late pointing. The correct text of verse 25 is, as I have already pointed out, simply **מןָא תְּקַל פְּרָם**. In the individual text from which our present Hebrew text is descended a scribe doubled the **מןָא**, presumably by accident. He attached **פְּרָם** to the preceding words by the conjunction **וּ**, an alteration of text which is very common, as can be seen by a comparison of parallel passages in our Hebrew text of the Bible. Conscious of the play on the word "Persian" contained in **פְּרָם**, he further changed that word, accidentally or intentionally, to **פְּרָסִי** (cf. Dan. vi. 29; Neh. xii. 22). A **וּ** was added to it, either to put it in the plural or purely by accident.

The pointing of the words is very perplexing. No explanation of any sort which has yet been offered seems satisfactory. Now the Hebrew and the Greek do not altogether agree in regard to the pointing. The former has a uniform pointing—**מןָא תְּקַל פְּרָסִי**. The latter has a different pointing for each word—*μανί*, *θεκέλ*, *φάρες*, which would correspond to **מןָא תְּקַל פְּרָם**. I am inclined to think that the pointing of the Hebrew text is the more original, and that it is intentionally artificial. The words were without pointing, not intended to be spoken. They represented merely the three radicals of the three roots without vowels. But in reading the text aloud it was necessary to pronounce these three words in some manner. They were for this purpose pointed, and intentionally so pointed that they should not be identical with any of the inflected forms from those roots, and they were pointed in a uniform manner. The pointing of **מןָא** in such a manner that it can be read as a passive participle is an accident due to the fact that that participle is regularly **מןִי** and not **מןָא**. The changes in the Greek are due in the case of the **ε** in the final syllables of *θεκέλ* and *φάρες* to the fact that those were closed, not open, syllables as in *μανί*.

But the most perplexing problem of the Book of Daniel

has been its composition in two languages instead of one. Chapter i.-ii. 3 is written in Hebrew. The fourth verse of the second chapter begins thus: "Then spake the Chaldaeans to the king in Aramaic." From that point to the end of the seventh chapter Aramaic is used. The eighth and following chapters, like the first chapter, are written in Hebrew. Following Jerome it was formerly supposed that Aramaic was here used, because it was the language of the Chaldaeans. The discoveries of the last half-century have shown conclusively, however, that this was not the case; that the Aramaic here used was not only not the language of the Chaldaeans, but not even the form of Aramaic which was used in Babylonia and the East. It is a Western Aramaic dialect, akin to the Palmyrene, and almost identical with the Aramaic of the Targum of Onkelos. It is, in fact, the vernacular of Palestine, the language spoken by the Jewish people, which supplanted Hebrew, the latter being retained only as a sacred language.

After this fact was clearly established, the theory was advanced that the whole book was originally written in Hebrew, but a portion of it having been lost, there has come down to us in place of this an Aramaic translation, or Targum. This theory was proved on literary grounds to be untenable, and it is now generally admitted that part of the book was written in the vernacular Aramaic and part in the sacred Hebrew, as we now have it.

It will be observed that the last verse of the seventh chapter, concluding the Aramaic part of the book, is the closing formula for a book or writing—"Here is the end of the matter," etc. Again, at the commencement of the Aramaic section, we have the separation from the preceding Hebrew carefully marked by the insertion at the close of the Hebrew section, which is of the nature of an introduction, of the words "in Aramaic." But the Aramaic section as it now stands, while complete at the end and rounded off with a formula which indicates the close of a writing, is incomplete at the commencement. The method of junction with it of the present introduction seems, however, to support the evidence

of the difference of language in indicating that the Hebrew first chapter and the Aramaic second chapter were not written together. But if this be the case, then the Aramaic section must have had another introduction, now lost, telling in substance that Nebuchadnezzar dreamed a dream. For this has been substituted a statement to that effect in Hebrew, probably a summary of the lost Aramaic introduction. This statement is part of a longer Hebrew section, now constituting the introduction to the entire Book of Daniel, in which we are told who Daniel was and his high character for wisdom, resulting from his minute adherence to the ritual prescriptions of the Law with regard to clean, unclean, etc.

The Aramaic section of the Book of Daniel contains a series of folk stories about the wonderful wisdom and the wonderful deliverances of Daniel and his three friends, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, in the times of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius, prefaced by a dream of Nebuchadnezzar, and concluded by a vision or apocalypse of Daniel, the two covering substantially the same ground. The scene of action is Babylon.

The succeeding Hebrew section of the book, like the preceding introduction to chapter i., contains no folk stories. It is more of the nature of a learned work referring, as in the ninth chapter, to the sacred writings of the Jews and showing a careful study and a fairly advanced mystical interpretation of those writings. The scene of action appears to be Shushan, or Susa, the Persian capital. It deals with mystical figures—"2000 and 300 evenings and mornings," (viii. 14), "weeks and half-weeks," etc. The first chapter of this section is, as to its meaning, largely a repetition of chapter viii., and indeed it might be called a variant of that chapter, carrying the vision forward, however, a little beyond the point at which that vision closed. Chapter ix. is a confession of sin and a prayer for deliverance, followed by a brief vision, the end of which is the pollution of the altar in B.C. 168. The remaining chapters, x.-xii., are, under the form of a vision, an historical survey of the period succeeding the

death of Alexander, becoming more and more minute until the year B.C. 165. The whole closes with a beautiful picture of the Messianic kingdom, and the resurrection of the dead Israelites, those who had been faithful, to share in the joy and triumph, and those who had proved faithless, to everlasting shame and contempt. It is in this part that the doctrines of angels and of the resurrection of the body appear.

Outside of the Book of Daniel the only mention in the Old Testament of a person of that name occurs in the Book of Ezekiel. In Ezekiel xiv. 14, 20 Noah, Daniel, and Job are mentioned as men of extreme righteousness, who might possibly be supposed by their righteousness to save sinners from destruction, and in Ezekiel xxviii. 3 we have Daniel mentioned as famous for wisdom. In the time of Ezekiel three men were evidently famous in folklore for their righteousness, and Daniel also for his wisdom. Of the character of the folklore which connected itself with Noah we know something from the earlier chapters of Genesis. The folk story of Job is substantially contained in the first two and the last chapters of that book as we at present have it. That folk story was made use of later by philosophical writers as the theme for the great dramatic poem of Job, dealing with the question of evil and calamity, which constitutes the bulk of our present Book of Job, set in between the prose narrative at the commencement and the close. The folklore about Daniel lies, we may fairly conclude, at the bottom of the stories in our Book of Daniel. All the stories that have come down to us connect this Daniel with the period of the Babylonian captivity. In some of those stories Daniel's deeds are singularly combined with old Babylonian myths, just as in Wendish folklore Frederick the Great appears as the hero of some stories, which are otherwise identical with fairy tales collected by Grimm from various parts of Germany, and which we know to be part of the ancient Teutonic heritage. (Similarly, in a Burgundian form of the Nibelungenlied, Burgundian historical events and characters of the fourteenth century are strangely commingled with the old Teutonic myth.)

Turning to the apocryphal additions to the Book of Daniel, which have come down to us only in a Greek form, we find probably in the story of Susanna a Babylonian legend of the seduction of two old men by the goddess of love. In this old Babylonian legend Jewish folklore made its hero, Daniel, play a part as the wise judge (cf. Ezek. xxviii. 3). In the contest of Daniel with the dragon, in which "Daniel took pitch and fat and hair, and did seethe them together, and made lumps thereof," we have the old Babylonian myth of the war between the god Bel and the monster Tiamat, which on the bas-reliefs is represented as a dragon. Growing out of this same myth of Bel and Tiamat, we find a variant story of Daniel's contest with the dragon, in which Daniel by a wise device is able to convict the priests of Bel of fraud. This shows more reflection and elaboration than the other. We have also, in the apocryphal additions, a variant of the story in the canonical book of Daniel in the lion's den. I am inclined to think that on the whole the stories in the apocryphal addition stand nearer than the stories in our canonical book to the original folklore about Daniel.

A considerable amount of folklore sprang up in the Exilic period and afterwards, and began to assume that peculiar moralistic tone with which we are familiar in the later Haggadic literature. Even in the Book of Kings we have an Haggadic story (1 Kings xiii.). From a later period we have some specimens of folk stories developed into what we to-day should call novels and novelettes, like the apocryphal books of Judith and Tobit, and in our canonical literature, the books of Esther and Jonah.

Daniel was the central figure of a number of folk tales of a somewhat similar character. There was what we may fairly call a cycle of stories of which he was the hero. Among these, besides the stories in which Daniel was the hero, there were also stories with other heroes. The Book of Daniel itself contains one story—that of the three children in the fiery furnace—in which Daniel is not the hero; and in the third chapter of the apocryphal book of First Esdras we have another similar

story of the Three Pages. This mass of stories, beginning in Babylonia, was passed down from mouth to mouth, and at the time of the Maccabæan revolt was familiar to the people in the vernacular Aramaic. Some of these stories a patriotic writer of that period used, recasting them as we now have them in the Aramaic portion of our canonical Book of Daniel. They dealt especially with the wisdom and the piety of the old folk hero, Daniel, and, after the manner of such patriotic tales, told how he was delivered in an extraordinary manner from great perils, and how he discomfited his foes, the conquerors and oppressors of the Jews. What was necessary to stir the Jews to resistance to Antiochus, to inspire them with a firm belief in the power and willingness of their God to intervene on behalf of His pious and oppressed people, and to fill their minds with the hope of deliverance out of tribulation and victory over their heathen foes, was to give the old folk stories, or rather a selection of them, a somewhat more distinctly religious character, and to touch and sharpen the details so that they should be more clearly applicable to present conditions. This was done by some unknown writer, who, making use of the apocalyptic method, prefaced and closed his little collection of pious and patriotic tales with two visions—the dream of Nebuchadnezzar and the dream of Daniel—both foretelling the final destruction of the oppressing Syrian, and thus giving a present application to the stories of Daniel's deliverance from the machinations of his foes and his victory over the power of the heathen in the times of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius. This little work was written shortly after B.C. 168. To understand its full force and the mighty influence which it exercised upon the people, one must read it in connexion with the First Book of Maccabees. One result of the patriotic uprising of the Maccabees was to revive, along with the religious patriotic hopes and feelings of the Hebrew people, the sacred language also. So we find in the Book of Psalms an outburst of patriotic and religious poetry from this period in the Hebrew tongue. The small Book of Daniel, ending, as already pointed out, with the words, "Here is the end of the matter," etc., at

the close of the seventh chapter, gave rise to further apocalypses, following the line of the Aramaic apocalypses of the second and seventh chapters of our present book, but written in Hebrew. These later apocalypses, as we have seen, are somewhat different from their Aramaic predecessors, more learned in style and making greater use of mystical interpretations, mystical numbers, and the like. The detailed history which they contain suggests also a composition slightly later in date, namely towards the close of B.C. 165 or the commencement of B.C. 164. The original Aramaic work and its Hebrew continuation seem to have been brought together shortly in one book, perhaps by the writer of these later apocalypses. To this larger work was prefixed an introduction, also written in the Hebrew tongue, which undertook to give some account of Daniel and the other pious heroes mentioned in the volume, and to explain from the standpoint of advanced legalism the reason of their great favour with God. In attaching this introduction to the volume, the Aramaic introduction to the dream of Nebuchadnezzar was cut out.

Later, in Alexandria, some of the other stories floating among the people with regard to Daniel were naturally enough incorporated with the book which bore the name of Daniel. A hymn and prayer which were composed in the name of the three children in the fiery furnace are also among the additions which we owe to the Alexandrian Jews.

That the apocalypse of Daniel exerted an immense influence on the thought of the Hebrew people is clear from the large amount of apocalyptic literature which was developed in the period immediately succeeding, which, as already pointed out in a former chapter, played a very important part in the development of the Messianic hope. While the Book of Daniel is not classed among the Prophets of the Hebrew canon, on account, as already mentioned, of its late origin, we cannot but count it a prophetic book. It was the successor of the older school of prophecy and is at one with the older prophetic writings in the belief in the eternal victory of the right and the glorious coming of the Kingdom

of God. By its use of folklore for prophetic purposes it took hold, in a very peculiar way, of the hearts of the people, and in the midst of desperate trials and perils inspired them with a belief and trust in God such as no academic statement of God's purpose, God's justice, God's might, and God's right could have achieved. It was divinely fitted for the time at which it appeared, and not for that time only. The history of its use in the Jewish and the Christian Church has proved its right to the claim of inspiration. It has strengthened untold thousands in trial and filled them with belief in deliverance and in the ultimate victory of God's cause.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX
ON
THE VIRGIN BIRTH

THE fourteenth verse of the seventh chapter of Isaiah is one of those passages in which the Septuagint Greek version represents the original reading. In the Hebrew this verse reads, literally translated: "Therefore, the Lord, He giveth you a sign. The young woman is pregnant, and beareth a son, and calleth his name God with us." Parallel passages for the words following *העֲלָמָה*, "the young woman," are Genesis xvi. 11: "Behold, thou art pregnant, and bearest a son, and callest his name Ishmael," and Judges xiii. 5: "Behold, thou art pregnant, and bearest a son." For the word *הָרָה*, as an adjective meaning, not "she shall conceive," but "pregnant," compare Genesis xxxviii. 24, 25; Exodus xxi. 22; 1 Samuel iv. 19; 2 Samuel xi. 5; Isaiah xxvi. 17; Jeremiah xxxi. 8. No other meaning can be given to this word than "pregnant," "with child"; and without some other word to denote future time it must indicate a present condition.

But it is the word *העֲלָמָה*, "the young woman," which constitutes the real difficulty of the passage. Professors Cheyne, G. A. Smith, and Dillmann all translate it literally as "the young woman." But what young woman? Having the article prefixed, it must be either some specific young woman, well known or previously referred to, or young women as a class distinguished from other classes. But it is manifestly neither of these; in fact, commentators have practically disregarded the article or explained it away, treating "the young woman" as being some indefinite young woman. Professor

Briggs¹ points out the impossibility of this treatment of the article. He proposes to regard הַ as the sign of the vocative, and translates: "Lo, young woman, thou art pregnant, and about to bear a son, and call his name Immanuel." But this treatment of הַ alone, with no further indication of the vocative, is grammatically untenable (Dillmann). Furthermore, putting the grammatical question aside, the meanings obtained by Briggs, Dillmann, Smith, and Cheyne all alike seem very weak, to say the least, and the sign ill-chosen and clumsily presented. Smith² comments upon the passage thus: "A child," he says, "shall shortly be born, to whom his mother shall give the name Im-manu-El—*God with us*. By the time this child comes to years of discretion, *he shall eat butter and honey*. Isaiah then explains the riddle. He does not, however, explain who the mother is, having described her vaguely as *a*, or *the young woman of marriageable age*; for that is not necessary to the sign, which is to consist in the Child's own experience. To this latter he limits his explanation." He throws aside as irrelevant and unimportant a part of the verse on which the prophet lays much stress, converts "*the young woman*" into "*a young woman*," and then drops her altogether as insignificant and unmeaning. That the mother is both necessary and important in this sign of the birth of Immanuel is evinced by the emphasis laid upon her in the verse, the space allotted to her, and the article attached to her name as one well known. The Septuagint reads *the virgin*, which is the translation of **הַבְּתִילָה**. A comparison of the Septuagint with the Hebrew consonant text shows us in every other word in the verse a complete agreement, evidence of a conscientious translation, and a correct transmission. This is well brought out by the treatment in the Septuagint of the word which the Masoretes point **גָּרַת**, *garath*, *she called*, apparently intending thereby the third person, singular, feminine. The Septuagint read the same consonants, but translated *thou shalt call*, pronouncing the word **γαράθη**, *garatha*, *thou calledst*.

¹ *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 195, note. ² *The Book of Isaiah*, i. p. 115.

Now, when we asked the question, Which change would have been more readily made, from *the young woman* to *the virgin*, or *vice versa*? I think it must be admitted that, supposing an original *the young woman*, it would be very difficult to find any reason for a change to *the virgin*; whereas, on the other hand, the statement that a virgin should become a mother, might very well have offended some stupid literalist, even if there were nothing else involved, and led to the substitution of **עלמה**, *young woman*, for **בתולה**, *virgin*. The presumption in favour of the Septuagint text, which is very strong, and would be regarded as sufficient evidence in a less important verse, is greatly strengthened by the testimony of the New Testament, and of the Peshitto Syriac version. The latter agrees with the Septuagint in reading *the virgin*. The New Testament gives independent evidence of the same reading in the received Hebrew text of the second half of the first century of our era. Neither Matthew i. 23 nor Luke i. 31 is a citation from the Septuagint; nor are they, probably, taken directly from the Hebrew. They seem, and more particularly is this true of the passage in St. Matthew's Gospel, to be translations from a secondary source, probably a traditional Aramaic rendering of the Hebrew, an oral Targum, current among the Jews at that time. They transmit to us *the virgin*, and not *the young woman*, as the current translation of the passage at the period of the composition of both the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Gospel of St. Luke, and thus testify that **הבתולה** and not **העלמה** was read in the received texts of that day.

But, substituting **הבתולה** for **העלמה**, and translating, "Behold, the virgin is with child, and is about to bear a son, and shall call (or 'thou shalt call') his name Emmanuel," what is the reference in **הבתולה**, *the virgin*? Who is this virgin? Micah iv. 8-10 is an excellent commentary on our passage. There we see the daughter of Zion in the pangs, as it were, of childbirth: "Writhe and twist, O daughter of Zion, like a woman in travail." The afflictions which befall the land, including the capture of Jerusalem itself, are the travail pangs

of the daughter of Zion, through which only can deliverance come. But not only is the daughter of Zion likened to one that is in travail; in the next chapter the figure is dropped, and she is spoken of as actually bringing forth a child. So the prophet says (v. 3), "Therefore He giveth them over until she that travaileth hath brought forth." Then follows the picture of the glorious reign of the Messiah, born of the daughter of Zion out of the travail of her affliction at the hand of the Assyrians. The whole passage is exactly parallel with our passage. Here also we have the virgin pregnant with a child, who shall be "God with us." The following verses narrate the desolation of the land, but through this "God-with-us" child of the virgin the kingdom shall be restored more glorious than before. Chapter viii. takes up this same "God with us." When the Assyrians shall appear to have destroyed all, there shall still remain this "God with us," by which the redemption and restoration shall be brought about. This "God with us" is the child of the virgin in Isaiah vii. 14; and it is the same child, we see by comparing the passages, who shall be the child of the travailing daughter of Zion depicted in Micah v. 2. The virgin of Isaiah vii. 14 is, then, none other than the virgin daughter of Zion, and the contemporary prophets, Isaiah and Micah, are found to be making use of the same figure, influenced by the same spirit.

Our next consideration is the use of the word "virgin" in reference to a city or people, and more particularly in reference to Jerusalem and Judah. Isaiah xxxvii. 22 and Lamentations ii. 13 use the full phrase, "virgin daughter of Zion"; while Jeremiah xiv. 17 has "virgin daughter of my people," and Lamentations i. 15, "virgin daughter of Judah." Micah uses both "daughter of Zion" and "daughter of Jerusalem." Amos v. 2 and Jeremiah xxxi. 4, 21 use "virgin of Israel," which is, perhaps, the closest to our passage. We also find foreign nations personified in a similar manner, as "virgin daughter of Zidon" (Isa. xxiii. 12), "virgin daughter of Babylon" (Isa. xlvi. 1), and "virgin daughter of Egypt" (Jer. xlvi. 11).

The Targum on Isaiah agrees with the Hebrew text in writing **העלמה**, *the young woman*, in place of **הבתולה**, *the virgin*, in this verse, and Jerome found the same word in the Hebrew texts of his day. The evidence seems to show that originally, and as late as the second half of the first century after Christ, the Hebrew texts read **הבתולה**, *the virgin*. Was the change to **העלמה**, *the young woman*, deliberately meant to exclude the Christian interpretation of the passage, or was it a mere blunder, the adoption into the text of the emendation of a stupid literalist?

INDEX

Alamoth, 189
 Alexandrian Jews, 5, 7 ff., 20 f., 23, 83, 194
 Alexandrinus, Codex, 9, 256
 Alfred's dooms, 96 f.
 Al-taschith, 184
 American use of the Psalter, 227 ff.
 Analysis of the contents of the Psalter, 177 ff.
 Angelology of the Psalter, 180
 Anglican use of the Psalter, 194 ff., 215 ff.
 Animism, 114
 Apocalyptic literature, 145, 312
 Apocrypha, The Old Testament, 9, 33
 Apocryphal additions to Daniel, 310
 —— Gospels, 36
 Arab worship and sacrifice, 276 ff., 285
 Arak el-Emir inscription, 271
 Aramaean inscriptions, 268 f.
 Aramaic in Daniel, 307
 Archaeology and the Bible, 237 ff.
 Ark, The, 116 f., 122, 284 ff.
 Arrangement of the Old Testament, 3, 15
 Articles of Religion, The XXXIX., 24 ff.
 Asaph Psalms, 165 ff., 178 f.
 Asherah, The, 128
 Asmonæan dynasty, The, 140 f.
 Assyrian records, 245, 253 f.
 Astruc, 90
 Augustine, St., 49 f., 196
 Authorised (or King James) Version, 15, 198
 Authority and Reason, 28 ff.
 Avesta, The, 240 f.
 Azazel, 114
 Azkara, 186, 199
 Baal Lebanon inscription, 267
 —— worship, 125 f.
 Babylonian inscriptions, 246 ff., 253, 266 f.
 —— psalmody, 176
 Barrier inscription, 253
 Baur, 240
 Behistun inscription, 298 ff.
 Behrmann, 305
 Benedicite, The, 225
 Bentley, 85 f.
 Bible Study, 51, 81 ff.
 Bliss, Dr., 259, 268, 277
 Book of the Covenant, 114, 120
 —— Dead, 289
 Books in early times, 263 ff.
 Briggs, Prof., 318
 Canaan, Language of, 248
 Canon of Old Testament, 4
 Carlstadt, 87
 Casting of lots, 123
 Centralisation of Hebrew worship, 122 ff.
 Ceremonial Law, The, 25
 Cheyne, Prof., 167, 173, 181 f., 317 f.
 Christ and Messianic prophecy, 151 f.
 —— —— the Decalogue, 27 f., 70 f.
 —— —— Messiahship, 151
 —— —— Old Testament, 55 ff.
 ——, Davidic descent of, 147
 ——, Divinity and Manhood of, 40 ff., 51
 Christ's birth in Bethlehem, 147 f.
 —— resurrection, 150
 —— temptations, 56 ff.

Christ's virgin birth, 150
 Chronicles and the Psalter, 166 f.
 Chronology, Usher's, 13 f.
 Circumcision, 107
 Clay tablets, Use of, 256 ff.
 Clean and unclean, 108 ff.
 Commandments, Moral and ceremonial, 25 ff.
 Comparative philology, 92 ff.
 Corruptions in the Hebrew text, 172, 258 f., 304, 306, 319
 Creeds, The, 24
 Cretan tablets, 260, 267
 Criticism, The Newer, 39 ff., 81 ff., 237 f.
 Daniel, The Book of, 293 ff.
 Darwin, 94
 David and Hebrew Psalmody, 175
 ———— Messianic expectation, 135 ff.
 Decalogue, The, 26 ff., 289 f.
 ———— written on stone tablets, 261
 Dedication, Feast of the, 187
 Deification of the Virgin, 42 f., 53
 De la Peyrière, 88
 Deuteronomy, The Book of, 129 f.
 Dillmann, Prof., 317 f.
 Docetic Gospel of St. Peter, 40 f.
 Doxologies, 200 ff.
 Du Maes, 88 f.
 Early Christian Psalmody, 205 ff.
 Edersheim, Dr., 146
 Egyptian discoveries, 249 ff., 253 ff.
 Eichhorn, 81 f., 90
 Enoch, The Book of, 30, 58, 145
 Epistles of Phalaris, The, 86
 Evolution, 94
 ———— of Israel, 99 ff.
 Ewald, 87, 91 f., 242
 Exile, The, 132 f., 174
 Ezekiel, 130 ff.
 Fall of Samaria, The, 126 f.
 Flood legend, The, 247 f.
 Folklore in Daniel, 301, 308 f.
 Foreign worship in Israel, 125 ff., 129
 Fourth Commandment, The, 27
 Gallican Psalter, The, 197
 Geddes, 90
 Giesebricht, 302
 Gilgal, 277 f.
 Gittith, 185
 God, The names of, 169 f.
 Gospel of St. Peter, Docetic, 40 f.
 Greek canon of New Testament, 20 f.
 ———— words in Daniel, 294
 Hallel, The, 200
 Hebrew Bible, Divisions of the, 3
 ———— Priesthood, The, 119 ff.
 ———— Pronunciation of, 273 ff.
 ———— ritual, 113 ff.
 ———— script (early), 268 ff.
 ———— — (modern), 270 ff.
 Hebrews, Religious development of the, 280 ff.
 ————, The, in Egypt, 286 f.
 Hexateuch, The, 169 f., 174, 177, 241, 252
 Higgaion, 190
 Higher Criticism, The, 39 ff., 81 ff., 237 f.
 Hilprecht, Prof., 176
 Hind of the morning, 187
 Historical inaccuracies in Daniel, 294
 Hobbes, 88
 Immortality among the Hebrews, 110, 181 ff.
 Imprecations in the Psalms, 226 f.
 Incarnation, The, and Newer Criticism, 39 ff., 52 ff.
 Inspiration of Scripture, 24 f., 34
 Isaiah, The Book of, 241
 ————, The call of, 128
 ————, Virgin birth in, 317 ff.
 Isaiahs, The two, 134
 Itala version, The, 195
 Jeduthun, 190
 Jerome, St., 49, 195 ff.
 John Baptist and Elijah, 63, 148 f.
 Jonah, The Book of, 134
 ————, The sign of, 63 ff.
 Judas Maccabaeus, 140
 Kinah verse, 216
 Korah Psalter, 171 ff., 178
 Lammenazzeah, 189

Latin canon of New Testament, 20, 23
 Law, The Mosaic, 4
 Le Clerc, 81 f., 89
 Levi and the Levites, 119 f., 130 ff.
 Levirate marriage, 114
 Liturgies, Early Christian, 207 ff.
 Localisation of Divinity, 104, 285, 287
 Luther, 19 f., 88

Maccabees, The, 134, 140
 Mahalath, 190
 Marseilles sacrificial tables, 115, 261, 268
 Maschil, 165, 190
 Matthew's, St., quotation of Old Testament, 66 ff.
 Mazzehah, 278
 Memorial psalms, 186
 Messianic hope, The, 135 ff.
 Michtam, 165, 184, 189
 Miserere, The, 225
 Mizmor, 165, 189
 Moabite Stone, The, 267
 Modern study of Bible, 81 ff.
 Monotheistic worship, 117 f.
 Moses, 116 ff., 136, 284 ff.
 Muth-labben, 190

Nabatæan inscriptions, 271
 Nature worship, 105 ff.
 Nazareth and *nezer*, 71 f.
 Neginoth, 189
 Nehiloth, 189
 Nethinim, 119
 New Testament, Arrangement of books, 16 ff.
 Newer Criticism, The, 39 ff., 81 ff., 237 f.
 Niebuhr, 86 f.
 Nippur, Discoveries at, 257, 261
 Nöldeke, 305

Old Testament, Arrangement of books, 3, 15
 ——, Canon of the, 4, 134
 ——, Development of the, 95 ff.
 Origen, 195

Palestine, Geography of, 251 ff.
 ——, Inscriptions in, 266 ff.
 Pentateuch, The Jewish, 4, 13, 16
 ——, The Samaritan, 4, 269 f.
 Persian words in Daniel, 294
 Pharisees, The, 182
 Phenician script, 266 ff.
 Pietistic glosses, 258 f.
 Praise Song of David, The, 163, 179
 Prayers of David, The, 161, 170, 178 f., 191
 Presbyterian views of Inspiration, 34
 Priest Code, The, 133, 169 f., 177
 Priesthood, The, 119 ff., 125, 133, 179
 Prophets, The, 5, 9
 ——, The, and Psalmody, 176 f.
 Psalm headings, 184 ff.
 Psalms for Sabbath and other days, 188, 199 f.
 ——, Imprecations in the, 226 f.
 Psalter, Growth of the Jewish, 155 ff.
 ——, Mechanical use of the, 209 ff.
 ——, of Solomon, 140 f., 203 f.
 ——, of the sons of Korah, 171 ff., 178
 ——, The books of the, 159 f.
 ——, The, and personal immortality, 181
 ——, The, and popular theology, 158
 ——, The Gallican, 197
 ——, The Prayer Book, 194 ff., 215 ff.

Quotation of Old Testament in New Testament, 58, 66 ff., 150 f.

Rashi, 48
 Reason and Authority, 28 ff.
 Reformation, The, and the Bible, 49 f., 87 ff.
 Religious conservatism, 112 ff.
 —— evolution of Israel, 99 ff., 280 ff.
 Renaissance, The, and the Bible, 84 ff.
 Revised (or Canterbury) Version, 15 f., 22
 Ritual, 113 ff.
 Rolls, The, 7

Sacred places, 101 f., 124 f.
 Sacrifice, 93, 103 f., 132, 278 ff.
 _____ among the Arabs, 285
 _____ in the Psalter, 179 f.
 Sadducees, The, 182
 Samaria, The fall of, 126 f.
 Samaritan Bible, The, 4, 269 f.
 Saxon Chronicle, The, 97
 Sayce, Prof., 288
 Schrader, 300
 Scripture and tradition, 24
 _____, Inspiration of, 24 f., 34
 Selah, 189 f.
 Septuagint, The, 5 f., 8, 318 f.
 Sermon on the Mount, 58 ff.
 Sheminith, 189
 Shiggaion, 190
 Siloah inscription, 252, 268
 Simon, Father, 89
 Sin and expiation, 109, 142 f.
 Sinaiticus, Codex, 256
 Smith, Prof. G. A., 252, 317 f.
 _____, Prof. Robertson, 174
 Songs of Degrees, 163, 191
 Spinoza, 87, 89
 Spirit world, The, 110 f.
 Stone worship, 276 ff.
 Syriac Version, The, 10, 319

Taboo, 101 f.
 Talmud, The, 145 ff.

Targums, 143 ff., 321
 Tatian's Diatessaron, 96
 Tel el-Amarna tablets, 246, 259, 266
 Tel es-Safi temple, 277, 282
 Tel Hesy tablet, 259, 266
 Temple, The, 115, 123 f.
 Temptations, Christ's, 56 ff.
 Tischendorf, 10, 21

Urim and Thummim, 123, 282
 Usher's Chronology, 13 f.

Vater, 91
 Vaticanus, Codex, 9, 256
 Veda, The, 47, 240 f.
 Venite, The, 222
 Vintage psalms, 184 ff.
 Virgin birth in Isaiah, The, 317 ff.
 _____, Christ's, 150
 _____, Deification of the, 42 f., 53
 Vowel points in Hebrew, 274, 304, 306
 Vulgate, The Latin, 11 f., 197

Weber, 145
 Writings (or Hagiographa), The, 7, 9, 12
 Wünsche, 150

Zinjirli, Discoveries at, 268
 Zwingli, 20

INDEX TO PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE.

Genesis i., pp. 48, 181; xiv., pp. 248 f., 253; xvi. 11, p. 317; xxviii. 17, p. 104; xxxi. 45 ff., p. 278; xxxvi. 31, p. 88; xxxviii. 24 f., p. 317; xl ix. 10, p. 144

Exodus iii. 6, pp. 68, 73; xix., pp. 55 ff.; xxi.-xxiii., pp. 114, 120; xxi. 22, p. 317; xxi. 24, p. 61; xxiv. 7, p. 264; xxxi. 18, p. 261; xxxii. 4, p. 262

Leviticus i., p. 132; iv., p. 110; vii. 11 f., p. 187; xi., p. 62; xvii., p. 122; xix. 18, pp. 27, 70 f.; xxiv. 7 f., p. 186; xxiv. 20, p. 61

Numbers x. 35 f., p. 171; xvi., p. 121; xxi. 17 f., p. 102; xxi. 30, p. 267

Deuteronomy i. 5, pp. 261 f.; vi. 4., p. 70; vi. 5, pp. 27, 70 f.; ix. 9, p. 261; x. 35 f., p. 157; xiv., p. 62; xix. 21, p. 61; xxiii. 6, p. 61; xxiv. 1, pp. 59, 264; xxvi. 5, p. 248; xxvii. 8, p. 261

Joshua i. 8, p. 264; iv. f., p. 278; xii. 23, p. 278

Judges v. 4, p. 287; xiii. 5, p. 317; xvii., pp. 119, 122

1 Samuel, ii. p. 121; iv. 19, p. 317; xiii. 9 ff., p. 121; xiv. 31 ff., pp. 103, 279; xxvi. 19, p. 104

2 Samuel vii. 16, p. 138; viii. 18, p. 122; xi. 5, p. 317; xxi., p. 110
 1 Kings vii. 36, p. 261; xiii., p. 310; xix. 8, p. 287
 2 Kings ii. 11, p. 140; iii. 4 ff., p. 267; iv. 39, p. 305; v. 5, p. 264; v. 17, p. 104; xvi. 10 ff., p. 264; xxii. 8, p. 88
 1 Chronicles iv. 23, p. 252; xvi. 8 ff., p. 167; xvi., pp. 157, 165, 167, 200
 2 Chronicles vi. 40 ff., p. 167; xxiv. 20 f., p. 69; xxvi. 21 ff., p. 121
 Nehemiah i. 5 ff., p. 169; viii. 9, p. 89; xii. 22, p. 306; xiii. 28, p. 269
 Job xiv. 17, p. 259; xix. 24, p. 262; xxxi. 35, p. 264; xxxii.-xxxvii., pp. 158, 182
 Psalms i., p. 161; ii., p. 161; iii.-xli. p. 161; iii. p. 157; iv., pp. 156, 212; ix. f., pp. 156, 162, 175; ix., p. 157; xiv., p. 163; xviii., p. 188; xix. 8 ff., p. 175; xxii. f., p. 217; xxix., pp. 175, 188 f.; xxx., p. 187; xxxviii., p. 186; xl., pp. 157, 164; xli. 13, pp. 159, 201; xl. f., pp. 156, 217 f.; xlii., pp. 102, 157, 172; xliv., pp. 156, 218; xlv., pp. 171, 173, 192; xlv. 2, p. 262; xlvi., pp. 157, 173, 218; xlxi., p. 171; li. 20 f., p. 157; liii., p. 163; lvi. 13, p. 179; lvii., p. 157; lx., pp. 157, 189; lxi., p. 171; lxv. ff., p. 171; lxviii., pp. 157, 171; lxviii. 12 ff., p. 224; lxix. 23 ff., pp. 225 f.; lxx., pp. 164, 186; lxxii. f., p. 160; lxxii. 18 f., pp. 159, 201; lxxiv., p. 174; lxxviii. f., p. 174; lxxx. pp. 157, 173; lxxxii., p. 173; lxxxiii. 6 ff., p. 174; lxxxiv. ff., p. 161; lxxxvi., pp. 157, 168; lxxxvi. 10, p. 180; lxxxix., p. 168; lxxxix. 52, pp. 159, 201; xcii., pp. 188, 199; xciv., pp. 212, 222; xcvi., p. 157; xcvi. 4 f., p. 180; c., p. 186; ci. 1, p. 159; civ. 7, p. 181; cv. ff., p. 157; cvi. 28, p. 180; cvi. 48, pp. 159, 201; cviii., pp. 164 f. 200; cix. pp. 61, 165, 226; cx. pp. 74, 140; cxi. ff., pp. 163, 201; cxviii., p. 157; cxviii. 22 f., p. 73; cxviii. 27, pp. 179, 223 f.; cxx. ff., p. 163; cxxxiv., p. 201; cxxxvi., p. 157; cxxxvii., pp. 225 f.; cxxxviii., pp. 163, 167; cxxxix., p. 167; cxlv. ff., pp. 163, 167; cxlvii. 15, p. 181; cl., pp. 159, 201
 Proverbs xxv. 1, pp. 127, 264
 Canticles viii. 9, p. 261
 Isaiah iii. 23, p. 262; vi., p. 141; vii. 9, p. 66; vii. 14, pp. 16, 317; viii., p. 320; viii. 1, p. 262; viii. 16, p. 258; ix. 1 ff., p. 138; xi. 1, pp. 71, 138, 144; xv. 2, p. 267; xvi. 10, p. 185; xix. 19, p. 282; xxiii. 12, p. 320; xxvi. 17, p. 317; xxx. 8, p. 264; xxxvii. 22, p. 320; xlvi. 17, p. 320; lvi. 7, p. 73; lxv. 8, p. 184
 Jeremiah iii. 1, p. 59; iii. 16, p. 291; viii. 8, p. 262; xiv. 17, p. 320; xvii. 1, p. 262; xx. p. 176; xxii. 18, p. 110; xxiii. 5, pp. 139, 144; xxix. 22, p. 301; xxx. 9, p. 139; xxxi. 4, p. 320; xxxi. 8, p. 317; xxxii. 11; p. 256; xxxii. 12, p. 264; xxxii. 14, p. 257; xxxiii. 11, p. 157; xxxvi. 23, p. 263; xlvi. 11, p. 320
 Lamentations i. 15, p. 320; ii. 13, p. 320
 Ezekiel ii. 10, p. 263; x. 2, p. 263; xiv. 14, p. 309; xxvii. 5, p. 261; xxviii. 3, p. 309; xxxiv. 23, p. 139; xxxvii. 24 f., p. 139
 Daniel i., pp. 62, 307; iv. 8, p. 303; v. 8, p. 304; v. 25 ff., pp. 303 ff.; vi. 29, p. 306; viii. 14, p. 308; ix. 2, pp. 264, 293; ix. 25 f., p. 135; xi. 2, p. 296; xii. p. 296
 Hosea iii. 4 f., p. 138
 Amos v. 2, p. 320; v. 23, p. 173; ix. 11, p. 138
 Micah iv. 8 ff., p. 319; v. 2, pp. 139, 144; v. 3, p. 320
 Habakkuk ii. 2, pp. 261 f.; iii. 3, p. 287; iii. 18, p. 144
 Haggai ii. 23, p. 139

Zechariah iv. 7 ff., p. 139; vi. 12 f., p. 140; ix. 9, p. 67; xiii. 3 ff., p. 130
Malachi iii. 1, p. 63; iv. 5, p. 63
1 Maccabees iv. 52 ff., p. 187
Matthew i. 23, p. 319; ii. 23, p. 146; iv., p. 55; v. 17, 18, pp. 58, 270;
v. 21 ff., p. 75; v. 22, p. 72; v. 31, p. 59; v. 33, p. 60; v. 38, 39,
p. 60; v. 43, p. 61; xi. 10, p. 63; xii. 38 ff., p. 63; xiii. 13 f., p. 66;
xv. 4, p. 68; xv. 11 ff., p. 61; xix., pp. 59, 70; xxi. 2 ff., p. 67;
xxi. 13, p. 73; xxi. 42, p. 73; xxii. 23 ff., p. 68; xxii. 36 ff., p. 70;
xxii. 41 ff., p. 73; xxiii. 35, p. 68; xxiv. 15, p. 69; xxiv. 36 f., p. 69
Mark iv. 11 f., p. 66; vii. 10, p. 68; vii. 15 ff., p. 61; xi., pp. 67, 73;
xii. 10, p. 73; xii. 18 ff., p. 68; xiii. 14, p. 69
Luke i. 31, p. 319; iv., p. 55; vi. 29, p. 61; viii. 10, p. 66; x. 25, p. 71;
xi. 29 ff., p. 64; xix., pp. 67, 73; xx. 17, p. 73; xx. 27, p. 68;
xxi., p. 70
John iv., p. 62; x. 22, p. 187
Acts vii. 22, p. 284; xvii. 28, p. 58
1 John v. 7, p. 72
Jude 14, p. 58

Date Due

BS1171 .P484
The Old Testament and the new

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00043 1801